OBEC

COTNER COLLEGE

COTNER COLLEGE


Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/milennialharbing0005alex

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER:

EDITED BY

Alexander Campbell.

COTNER COLLEGE

I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation, and tribe, and tongue, and people; saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come; and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water. JOHN.

Great is the truth, and mighty above all things, and will prevail!

VOLUME V.

BETHANY, VA.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR.

1834.

Published by
THE OLD PATHS BOOK CLUB
BOX V
ROSEMEAD, CALIFORNIA

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Number I.——Volume V.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Bethany, Va. January, 1834.

PREFACE.

CAN any one of our readers imagine how he would feel prepared to write a preface to a volume, of the contents of which he is almost as ignorant as any of his readers? or with what composure and preparation of mind he could grasp his pen after being jolted over the back bone of the Union, at the rate of one hundred miles and more in twenty-four hours; and after one continued series of discourses, addressed to Jews, Gentiles, Samaritans, Christians, and every thing clean and unclean which lies between the antipodes, for three months, in longitude and in latitude from one and a half to three hours each; having in his ears the dying echo of a thousand questions on every thing, from the broodings of the Good Spirit on chaos, down to the morning of the resurrection; and having before his eyes the receding groups of listening crowds from the borders of the Carolinas to the Empire City of the New World?—Then, indeed, may he imagine our preparation of mind this morning, in sitting down, for the first time for one hundred days, in our writing chair, to resume the labors of the pen, and to cast about our thoughts over the past and the future for a premonition to our readers of the fates of the forthcoming volume. Amidst these perturbations incident to frail and erring man from so many exciting causes, we can only say what is uppermost in our thoughts, and what is as fixed in our minds as the magnetic pole.

Our recent tour has deepened the convictions expressed in the concluding remarks of the preceding volume. The press must do its duty—the tongue and pen must move in the cause of him who consummates all moral ends by moral means. No person, says the Great Teacher, lights a lamp and then covers it under a corn mea-

sure; but rather places it upon a lofty stand, that it may give light to all in the family. The Bible alone contains the light of eternity. Man's relations to the unseen and eternal world are developed on its pages with unerring certainty. The path of life is laid open there. But the multitude will not read it, and the many who read it cannot understand it while the vail of traditions, dyed in mysticism, hangs before their eyes. The public mind is, with few exceptions, in the hands and under the keys of those who call themselves the Ambassadors of Heaven—of those who presume to think for the multitude, while that multitude labors for them.

Much is said in commendation of the Bible, but more in commendation of the benevolent schemes of this age of enterprize. A desperate struggle there is for the sceptre of Judah. The sects are all consolidating their efforts, forming new bonds of union and co-operation in the cause of partyism. Every rivulet, from the Sunday School Union, up to the Temperance Associations, is directed into the channel of sectarianism—Catholics against Protestants, and Protestants against Catholics, and both against the Apostles' doctrine and for their own partizan establishments. Should we falter in our course, or remit our efforts, the flood of proselytism would sweep from the face of christendom every vestige of primitive christianity. I speak for the whole Christian brotherhood who have resolved to keep all the commandments of Jesus. Shall we not then, brethren, learn a parable from the children of this strange race, who are more prudent in conducting their affairs than the children of light? Shall we lash the helm and let the vessel drive before the wind? No! Let every man do his duty! Remember the parable of the talents: its moral contains a lesson to every age.

I have wished that the burthen which I have borne were lessened: that I could retire from the contest and the incessant toils of mind and body which I have for many years endured in pleading the Bible claims upon all mankind. Experience, Observation, Faith, Hope, and Love say, 'Slacken not the reins—be not weary in doing good—combat the good combat of faith—be valiant for the truth—earnestly contend for the faith formerly delivered to the saints.' We cannot, we dare not falter while the voice of God, and of the people who love the kingdom and the appearing of the Saviour, says, *Persevere!*

We must be more pointed, practical, zealous, indefatigable. The prospect before us is full of promise; but even the garden of Eden called for the dressing and keeping of Adam. We must labor and cultivate the soil, or we cannot eat the fruits of the earth. The public mind must be enlightened and the efforts of Christians must be concentrated to the great objects of Messiah's reign. We live not for ourselves. We are the Lord's. The present volume, besides the series of things in regular train, shall touch upon some themes yet in the shade, and will give some new directions to the thoughts of our readers on the destinies of things connected with the glories of future times. The morals of Christians shall have a more conspicuous place on the canvass of the present age, and the tendencies of principles shall be more fully delineated in the practices of men.

But we cannot promise more than our best efforts in the work of the Lord, and our determination to persevere in perfecting what is now begun and in progress. The labors of the New Testament, in so far as the editions of it have occupied our time, now being completed, we hope to have more time to devote to this work, and to be able to issue each number, after the next, at an earlier period in the month. And nothing on our part shall be wanting, as far as circumstances will permit, to minister edification to our readers.

EDITOR.

January 10*th*, 1834.

The Body of Christ.

"YOU ARE ONE BODY IN CHRIST."

THE animal functions of the human body are all comprehended under two terms—namely, *assimilation* and *excretion*—that is, the human machine is dependent for its existence on the healthy discharge of the functions involved in these two terms. By the various processes implied in *assimilation* the body recruits its waste; and by *excretion* those substances and parts of substances taken into the system, which are foreign, are thrown out by the proper emunctories. These emunctories are seven in number—namely, the bowels, the kidneys, the eyes, ears, throat, nose, and skin. Now all substances taken into the stomach are either foreign or homogeneous—that is, they are either capable or not capable of being appropriated to the nourishment of the body. If they are susceptible of animalization, and can be transformed into blood, bones, and other parts of the body, then they are styled homogeneous; but if they are incapable of animalization, then they are discharged by the proper excretory canals and are styled foreign.

Now the church is called a body, of which the gospel may fitly be styled the mouth, for by it is taken in the matter that is to become its future members. Do the fact and figure, then, hold of each other in the matters of assimilation and excretion? They do. The body of Christ, which is the church, will find that her health and strength in the faith of Jesus depend ultimately on the transformation or the ejection of those taken into her communion.

Transformation.— Christianity calls not for a bare reformation from evil practices; but for an actual transformation or assimilation to the Lord Christ. Be you transformed, says the Apostle, by the renewing of your mind, that you may approve the will of God, which is good, and acceptable, and perfect. What, then, are the processes by which a person taken into the church is to be transformed and made like unto the body? The various processes to which our natural aliment is subjected before the assimilative particles can be elaborated, are wonderful: they are, digestion, absorption, circulation, and nutrition. In the church the ordinances of Christ, (reading, medita-

tion, prayer, instruction, &c. &c) may fitly be styled the means by which the Christian church is finally to assimilate to the likeness of herself and Christ those received into her communion. Of what immense value, then, is it that she see these ordinances be attended to by all over whom she has any control! The neglect of them (namely, reading, meditation, prayer, &c.) will prove the destruction of every church; for as well might we hope to enjoy health while the food of a week lies undigested in our stomach, as to hope for the perfection of those received into the church, if instruction and godly ordinances are neglected. Some churches read little, pray little, meditate none: and the result is, that they resemble a body overtaken with a decay—they are sickly and decaying, or feverish and nervous, doting and debating on the things of time and sense. They are dyspeptic in religion, and cannot digest; consequently, can neither assimilate what is homogeneous, nor eject what is foreign. Some churches would need to be both purged and vomited, and cupped and sweat. There must be something wrong with certain churches, for they have no members which are useful; they resemble bodies without arms, or arms without hands; and to add to them by immersion is like throwing a piece of fresh food into a diseased or dyspeptic stomach. Purge out, then, the old leaven of malice, and let the churches be unlevened masses of sincerity and truth.

Expurgation.—The application of the laws of the Redeemer in the expulsion and reformation of unruly and impure members, forms an important branch of Christian discipline; but a church has far more merit in reforming one of her members than in expelling half a dozen. To put away is an easy matter; but it was beautifully characteristic of the Lord Jesus, that, of all whom God had given him, he had lost none save one. The church, then, should summon all her means to gather into her bosom all the sons of men; and when she has accomplished this, she should next exert all her powers to retain them there; teaching them, and building them up in the church, as in Christ's school, in all holiness and knowledge, in order to fit them for future usefulness.

It were impossible, perhaps, to enumerate the various precious results flowing from the natural and steady operation of the two Christian laws of *transformation* and *expurgation*. By the first the church's members are made like to Christ; by the last, those of them, who, through want of faith, or courage, or decision, are incapable of improvement, are thrown out, and the health of the whole body, as well as its character with the public, are preserved and honored.

In the first instance I have seen churches which attended carefully to these laws, fling abroad upon the face of society, in their respective localities, the most grateful moral influences; so that when the evangel or gospel of the Lord Jesus came to be announced by a capable proclaimer, it was as if the Lord touched the mountain and it smoked; the population was reformed, revolutionized, and the church crowded and increased by the addition of very many new converts, abounding in praise and glory to God and to the Lamb. But Christianity is to

be treated according to its proper nature; and if we are permitted to gather together all kinds of fish, we are also permitted to cast the bad away. To catch, then, and afterwards to discern between the good and the bad, are important items among the sacred duties of the church; but these duties are not always the objects of equal care and solicitude with the churches; and this is a matter greatly to be deplored. I have seen some folks scrupulously severe in their attention to church order and purity, without regarding the increase of the body by the addition of new members; and I have seen others all alive to the conversion of the world, whose regard to purity and good order was not of the most commendable kind. To have the one thing done without leaving the other undone, is the Saviour's rule.

I could imagine to myself a church perfect in love and perfect in labor—herself walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blamelessly—and her messengers and apostles scattered throughout society like the stars of heaven, bright and burning—bringing to her bosom the objects of the grace of God to be reformed for immortality. Such a church shall be styled a fruitful bough, even a fruitful bough by a well, whose branches run over the wall. Her branches shall spread, and her beauty shall be as the olive tree, and her odor like that of Lebanon; they who dwell under her shadow shall return; they shall revive as the corn, and grow as the vine; the odor thereof shall be like the odor of the wine of Lebanon. She shall be the choice vine of the Lord who redeemed her.

WALTER SCOTT.

Meeting-Houses.

AS the disciples are now engaging in the erection of houses of worship in various portions of the United States, it may not be unseasonable to offer a few remarks on this business.

It cannot be doubted by those who reflect upon all that operates upon the human mind, that convenient and comfortable houses for the public worship of Christian congregations, and for the accommodation of those who may be induced to visit their assemblies, is as necessary as private dwellings for our families and friends. He who wishes to enjoy domestic life and the sweets of social intercourse, provides himself, if in his power, with a house sufficiently commodious. If a congregation wish to prosper and increase, they must have some place in which to assemble, and to which to invite those whom they desire to see partakers of the blessings and honors of the family of God. We must erect a stand on which to place the lamp, if we would have ourselves or others to enjoy its light. We must not complain that our worship is not attended, nor our discourses and admonitions heard, if there be no provision for hearers or attendants. Places of meeting are just as necessary as paper and ink for the spread of truth.

But as this is almost universally admitted, we proceed to ask why

is it that Christians are so remiss in contributing for this good work? Pagans could contribute liberally to the erection of splendid temples—Jews could erect synagogues in every city and village—the sectaries can spend their myriads in building what they call "churches;" and some of us disciples are as fearful of spending money in this way as of committing sacrilege. If we apply our money to better purposes, it is well, and will tell well hereafter; but if we save money from the cause of our Master, to beautify and adorn our own mansions, while there is no place provided for the exhibition of the truth, nor for the comfort of our brethren, what do we more than others?—Nay, indeed, we do less.

But it may be said, 'they have foolishly or formally lavished thousands from ambition, pride, or vanity, or for the gratification of a false superstition, and we are wiser than they.' Well, be as *pious* as they, and offer no incense to pride or vanity. It requires much less expense of time and money to be humble than to be proud; to be comfortable than to be fine; to be Christians, than to be Jews or Mahommedans. But if idolatry has more power over the avarice of its votaries than the gospel has over our cupidity, in what does our religion excel? It is false logic to refuse the God of heaven the honor of a place of meeting for his praise, because Pagans have reared temples to idols.

The point, however, before us, is the mode or style in which Christian synagogues should be erected. There appears to be no great taste in this business. Stately synagogues, with tall steeples, lofty pulpits, and magnificent galleries, are a satire upon the Christian profession. A Christian meeting-house ought to be humble, commodious, and free from all the splendor of this vain and sinful world. Were we called upon to project a meeting-house consonant to reason and religion, we should have to describe one which we have never seen. It should be a one story house, without steeple, galleries, or pulpit. The floor should be an inclined plane, descending from the entrance one foot in every eight or ten. The Lord's table and the seats for the elders of the congregation should be at the remote end, opposite to the entrance, and consequently on the lowest part of the floor, visible to every eye in the house. To those acquainted with the philosophy of sound it would be unnecessary to say any thing on the superior ease of speaking and of hearing in a house so fashioned; nor is it necessary to say that the facility of seeing the speakers would be equal to the facility of speaking and hearing. These are matters most apparent.

The house should be so divided that both the members of the church and the attending public might be equally well accommodated.—Around the elders of the congregation, and immediately contiguous to the Lord's table, the disciples should be placed. To prevent confusion, and to afford every facility to the auditors, a door or railing across the aisle, at a proper distance to accommodate the brethren, should mark the seats allowed to the attendants. This should be so arranged as that, without much inconvenience, it can be moved far-

ther towards the door as the church increases. On coming into such a house the disciples and attendants seat themselves on their respective seats, and thus they see, feel, and exhibit their relations, and enjoy their respective rights in the most impressive and advantageous manner. These arrangements are not only rational, and in accordance with the common sense of mankind, but would contribute much to the edification and comfort of the congregation.

More than half the expences of erecting a meeting house would be saved on this plan, inasmuch as the fashionable columns, galleries, and pulpits of this age constitute the chief items of expense.

Every thing in the Christian congregation ought to correspond with our high calling—with the humility, spirituality, and heavenly-mindedness of the Christian profession. Our houses of worship ought not to indicate a spirit or temper repugnant to our profession, but exhibit to all that the pride of life has no abiding in the hearts of the admirers and worshippers of him who has promised to dwell with the man who is of "an humble and contrite spirit, and who trembles at his word." EDITOR.

Catholic Controversy---No. 2.

THE prominent and characteristic dogmas asserted in Mr. Hughes' first letter, on which so great reliance is placed by the Romanists, are the following:—

1. "The prolific principle which has produced such a harvest of creeds, in which the wheat of sound doctrines is scarcely perceptible amidst the tares and cockle of delusion, is—*private interpretation.*" Letter 1. page 2.*

2. "The *Bible alone* is not that practical rule of faith established by Christ to guide us in matters of religion, and to determine disputes in his church."—page 3.

3. "I defy any one to prove from *the Bible alone,* that the Bible is an authentic and inspired book." p. 4.

4. "Since the origin of Christianity not so much as one single dispute has been determined by the Bible alone." p. 5.

5. "It is impossible that the Bible alone should be the infallible rule of faith established by Christ." p. 6.

6. "Jesus Christ never inculcated the belief of an opinion." p. 6.

7. "It was not universally known, till the end of the fifth century, what books were to be regarded as inspired scriptures." p. 4.

To these and other assertions in the first letter, equally palpable, Mr. Breckinridge opposes the following:—

1. "The Catholic rule of faith is, 'The Old and New Testaments, with the books called Apocrypha, as contained in the old Vulgate Latin edition, and unwritten traditions, interpreted by a visible infallible judge of controversies, according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.' Council of Trent. 4 Sess. Creed of Pope Pius." p. 11.

2. "If you [Catholics] have an infallible visible judge of controversy, how do you get at the proof his infallibility? Is he not appointed by Christ? You say he is. Then you find the proof of it in the sacred scriptures of course. How, then, do you interpret those scriptures in discovering that there is such a judge? Not infallibly; for the existence of any infallible judge is yet to be proved. And as regards his existence, you are left, as you must admit, to decide from scripture by your own unaided reason. Your judgment on the sub-

**We quote from Bird's edition of the controversy—Philadelphia,* 1833.

ject is formed upon the same principle as ours. Can you, then, claim any more certainty for your opinion than we for ours? If you can, show it:—if not, your argument against our rule, if sound, destroys your own." p. 13.—[This is a good argument, and no Catholic can fairly meet and refute it.]

5. "Bellarmine has fifteen notes of the true church. These are all to be proved from scripture. By whom?—By fallible men, by private interpretation?"——"You (by private interpretation) take the Bible to find the infallible judge, and then return with him to learn what the Bible means." page 13.—[This is true of the Catholic rule, and cannot be avoided by Mr. Hughes.]

4. "The Apostles were to have no such [inspired] successors." page 14. "Admit the Bible to be a revelation, and then it follows that it is an infallible rule of faith." p. 14.

5. "You prove the Church by the Bible, and the Bible by the Church."—page. 16.

6. "Origen, A. D. 210; Eusebius, 315; Athanasius, 315; Cyril, 340; Council of Laodicea, 364, &c. &c. give catalogues of the inspired books. Most of them give an exact catalogue of the New Testament. If there was an infallible judge from the commencement, how was it that the church was four hundred years in suspense about the rule of faith!

7. "Joanna Southcoate claimed to be infallible, and so the Shakers. May they not be right?" p. 18.

8. "We are told in Genebrand's Chronicles to 904, that in 150 years fifty Popes had been apostate rather than apostolical." p. 18. "Pope Liberius became Arian—Pope Honorius a heretic—and Pope Marcellinus an idolator."

9. "The Council of Trent and the Pope say, 'Inasmuch as it is manifest from experience, that if the Holy Bible translated into the vulgar tongue, be indiscriminately allowed to every one, the temerity of men will cause more evil than good to arise from it." p. 19.

10. "Arianism was sanctioned by the Papal church; that is, by the Pontiff, a general council, and the collective clergy." p. 19.

11. "You are divided about the supremacy of the Pope. Some give him a mere presidency—others make him a civil and exclusive monarch—others set him by the side of God." p. 19.

12. "As to the *seat of infallibility* in the church, there is neither union nor uniformity. Four systems are on this subject. One places it in the Pope—another, in a General Council—a third in the two united—and a fourth in the church collective." p. 19.

13. "Nor are you agreed *in which are the general councils.*"

14. "The apochryphal books are excluded by the Jews. They are not recognized by Christ or his Apostles. They do not claim to be inspired." p. 20.

15. "There is no unanimous consent of the Fathers concerning unwritten traditions." p. 20.

The discerning reader of these extracts, and of the original from which we draw them, needs not to be told that these disputants are rather making reprisals and pursuing retaliatory measures, than arguing the proposition to which they pledged themselves. The question is, *What is the infallible rule of faith?* Mr. Hughes says it is *not* the Bible alone. Mr. Breckinridge says it is *not* the Bible, Apochrypha, and unwritten tradition. But neither of them meets his antagonist face to face, nor attacks him in his own entrenchments. Like the French and English in former times, when they dared not meet and fight on either of their premises, the French despoiled the English *foreign* dependencies, while the English harrassed the French possessions. So these gentlemen think they can succeed better by proving each other wrong, than by proving themselves right.

Kind nature has given horns to the ox, hoofs to the horse, claws to the lion, and paws to the bear, and to every creature sense to know where his strength lies. Mr. Hughes feels himself more able to harrass his antagonist with the errors of Protestantism, than in proving the infallibility of the Pope; and Mr.

Breckinridge is equally confident that his strength lies in exposing the grossness of Popery, rather than in defending the claims of Presbyterianism.

The verbiage of these gentlemen is equally at fault, and neither of them appears sensible of it. What is the meaning of the terms *fallible* or *infallible* applied to a *rule?* Then wood and iron may sin! We may err in applying or in misapplying a correct rule; and an imperfect rule may cause us to err; but the rule itself never errs. Adam was fallible; Jesus was infallible—*persons*, not *things*, may or may not err. The sophistry of the trope has beguiled these disputants into a mere logomachy. Free agency belongs to *persons*, not to *things*. And unless these gentlemen imagine that rules are free agents, they ought not to speak of them in a style which belongs only to angels and to men.

Again, the phrase "*private interpretation*," which is so cardinal in this controversy, is most ridiculous. There is no such phrase authorized in the Bible. It has no distinctive meaning. Is there such a thing as public or general interpretation—public or private meaning? If there is no public meaning, there is no private meaning. If there be no public or general interpretation, there can be no private or particular interpretation. But *private* with them is, perhaps, equivalent to *individual*. Be it so; then private interpretation is individual interpretation—every individual interpreting for himself!

But next comes the word *interpretation*. What does it mean? To *interpret* is to translate, to explain. To explain publicly or privately—what? There can be no such thing as private explanation. It is absurd. Can a person explain a thing to himself? He may to another. But then it is no longer *private*.

Again, what is to be interpreted?—The prophecy, or the scripture? Say the former, and it may be granted; but say the latter, and then neither the Pope, nor a general council, nor the whole church, nor Messrs. Hughes and Breckinridge can interpret it only in so far as they translate it into the mother tongue. A man must understand for himself; for all the world cannot understand for him. A man may translate for himself; but to explain to himself is as impossible as to understand for another.

Do the gentlemen mean *private understanding* and *public understanding?* or what do they mean? But if we should imagine that *private* means *individual*, and that the *interpretation* means *explanation*, then if an individual's explanation is fallible, will not the explanation of a general council be also fallible? For what is a general council but a collection of individuals? And if one cypher will not make a unit, the question is, How many cyphers will make a unit? or how many fallible interpreters will make one infallible expositor of scripture? The whole debate on this subject is '*vox et preterea nihil*,'—sound and nothing else. Gallons of ink might have been saved, and reams of paper might have been gifted to the Bible Society, if these gentlemen had attended to the meaning of words.

It is not the Bible as explained by one or many—no, not the Bible as explained by one or one million—one layman or one pope, that is a perfect rule for the faith of any other person than the explainer. These gentlemen are equally at fault in supposing that the Bible alone, as explained by each person for himself, or by one infallible explainer, the pope and the council, ever can be a rule of faith to any society apart from the explainer or explainers. The Catholic and Protestant hypothesis of private or public, particular or general explanation, is wholly extravagant and erroneous. Neither John Calvin, Martin Luther, or Pope Pius could explain the "Bible alone" as a perfect rule for any person. Each of these explainers supposes something which they call "*the doctrines*" of the Bible—i. e. their own excogitations from the Book alone, as the rule of faith. Hence we have the Catholic doctrines and the Protestant doctrines—the former excogitated and concocted by a large council; the latter by a small council, which they make the perfect rule of faith, instead of the Bible alone.

A *rule of faith!* What absurdity! A *rule of doctrine* rather! The phrase "*rule of faith*" is also extravagant. "*Rule of faith*," if at all an admissible phrase, must mean *evidence* or *testimony*. This alone is the rule and measure of faith. Law is the rule of morals;—testimony the rule of faith;—and the

Apostles' teaching, the rule of doctrine. If we cannot apprehend their teaching, we cannot apprehend the teaching of a Catholic Pope or a Protestant Pope.

In one word, the controversy between these gentlemen, in its real merits, as we shall still farther demonstrate, is about whether we shall have *one big Pope* or *many little ones*—between something called *private interpretation* from a little Pope, and something called *public interpretation* from a big Pope, as the rule of faith, sentiment, doctrine, morals, and religion. If I am to have a Pope, I say it is better to have one big Pope than a herd of little ones; but rather let me have Jesus and his Apostles as my infallible guides in faith, sentiment, and behaviour.

The reader may be curious to read for himself the proper and rational interpretation or translation of this passage in 2 Pet. i. 21. We shall give it him. "Knowing this first, that no prophecy of scripture is of private impulse: for never at any time was prophecy brought by the will of man; but the holy men of God spoke, being moved by the Holy Spirit."—[New Version, 4th edition.]

It is admitted that the word *epilusis*, rendered by some *untying*, *invention*, *discovery*, *impulse*, is one of the *apax legomena*, or words which occur but once in the Christian Oracles. Hence its meaning here must be ascertained from the context. It is applied to the prophets in reference to the origin of their discoveries and disclosures. They did not themselves declare and unfold the views which they communicated. They uttered the suggestions of the Holy Spirit. This is most obviously its contextural signification here. Therefore, they were not of themselves (privately) led or impulsed to utter these prophecies but by the Spirit of God. So Benson, Macknight, Thompson, and Adam Clarke, *cum multis aliis*. The fair interpretation of this passage shows how baseless is the whole system of private and public interpretation as a rule of faith.

EDITOR.

Weekly Communion.

EVERY week, at least, the table of the Lord should be spread for Christian assemblies,—*Calvin's* Inst. 6. W. C. 17, 8. 43, 46.

"The Independent churches in England," says the biographer of Dr. Owen, "at the beginning, observed the Lord's supper every first day of the week."

In the Baptist Confession of Faith, published in 1611, is the following article; "That every church ought, according to the example of Christ's disciples, primitive churches upon every first day of the week, being the Lord's day, to assemble together to pray, prophecy, praise God, and break bread, and perform all other parts of scriptural communion for the worship of God, and their own mutual edification and the preservation of true religion and piety in the church.—*Crosby's Hist. Baptists, vol.* ii.

When we speak of innovation in the church of Christ, we are not to inquire what was done by our fathers, but what was the order of the church from the beginning? How did Christ ordain? How did his Apostles conduct? In what state did they leave the churches? Now it is notorious, that during the three first centuries of the Christian era, communions were held with a frequency, of which, among us, we have neither example nor resemblance. It is also notorious, that the original frequency of communion declined as carnality and corruption gained ground; and it is no less notorious, that it has been urged as a weighty duty, by the best of men and the best of churchess, in the best of times. It is demonstrable, that among the primitive Christians, the celebration of the Supper was a part of the ordinary sanctification of the Lord's day. In this manner did the spirit of ancient piety cherish the memory of a Saviour's love. There was no need of reproof, remonstrance, or entreaty, &c.

[*Dr. Mason, of New York.*]

Notes on a Tour to New York---No. 4.

ON landing at Baltimore, on Tuesday, the 20th November, we were met by brothers Carman, Farquharson, and Henshal, who conducted us, by special request, to the residence of Mr. Sands, whom we left a citizen of the kingdom of the Messiah. Application was made to several religious communities for a house suitable to accommodate the citizens who might please to attend our lectures. Mr. Gibson, a Presbyterian, was liberal enough to proffer his house; but Mr. Nivens, more in the spirit of the party, interposed, and *vetoed* the tender. The Unitarians and the New Jerusalem Church liberally offered theirs, unsolicited; but they were deemed too small. We had, from our former acquaintance with our friend Mr. John Findley, of the First Baptist Church, who has infused into his charge a more liberal spirit than his own—expected, with some degree of confidence, a little Christian hospitality, especially as he is considered almost as *heretical* as ourselves; but, alas! for the honor of *the Clergy* in the Year of Grace 1833, and in the city of Baltimore, the *Parson* triumphed over the *man;* and when 'asked for a *fish*, he gave us a *scorpion!*' The brethren had, before we received these honors, agreed for Scotti's Hall, a room which held about 800 persons.

Lectures were delivered in this Hall on the evenings of the 22d, 23d, 24th, 25th, and 26th, and one on the Lord's day afternoon. The first had respect to very general matters and things—a sort of introductory, designed to disabuse the public mind of the numerous mistakes, misapprehensions, and misrepresentations, interestedly promulged by those parasites of the people, who suppose that all gain is true godliness, and that the true faith is that which truly promotes the wealth and honor of the spiritual merchants. Our second lecture geographically and chronologically ascertained the commencement of the Christian gospel, in contradistinction from all other gospels—Patriarchal, Jewish, or Pagan. Brother Hall next developed the items which are essential to the salvation of the soul, and drew forth these in a practical disquisition upon faith and reformation. On the morning of the Lord's day we met with the brethren at the Bazaar, and enjoyed ourselves very much, indeed, in the honors of the day, as celebrated by the simple-minded and sincere-hearted followers of the Apostles. After the social worship of the morning and the commemorations of our Master's death, I was invited by the Elders of the congregation to address the church. After reading the history of the conversion of the Thessalonians, and the beginning of the first letter addressed to them, we called the attention of the brethren to the subject of *relative duties*, with especial reference to "the sounding forth of the gospel from them." This all-important subject is engrossing much more of the attention of the brethren generally, and of the members of this very exemplary congregation specially. The brethren are awaking to the consideration that the conversion of the world is now committed to the congregations of the saints;—that their own holiness and happiness are greatly promoted by making others holy

and happy;—that to be blessed themselves, they ought to bless others. Since the days of supernatural gifts and men, the congregations of the saints are to sound abroad, both by word and deed, the salvation of Jesus; and this calls for all the knowledge, experience, and powers of communication with which they are gifted. But there is one means, and it is one powerful means of conversion, to which these brethren have long been attentive—that is, the immense value of living the gospel life. Without this, the science of Paul and the eloquence of Apollos are all in vain.

In the afternoon, at Scotti's Hall, we addressed a full house, on *the nature of obedience*, illustrated in the case of Samuel and Saul, in reference to the destruction of the Amalekites—1 Samuel xvi.

1. That obedience was, and is, and evermore shall be the only way to enjoyment in every department of rational existence, was demonstrated from the nature of the human constitution itself, as well as from the unequivocal declarations of the unerring Spirit.

2. That God and our own happiness never can require less than perfect and perpetual obedience to that constitution of things under which man is placed.

3. The difference between obedience of law and the obedience of faith, illustrated.

4. Obedience is in its nature universal, not partial; for partial obedience, as explained by Samuel, is no better than disobedience and rebellion—a rejection of the word of the Lord.

5. The blessings connected with the obedience of law, and the blessings connected with the obedience of faith, concluded this address.

In the evening of the same day, and in the same place, to a very crowded house, we descanted at considerable length upon the most common error of all the religions of the world, and of all ages of the world—from the days of Confucius and Zoroaster—from the days of Jannes and Jambres—in all the systems of religious philosophy, it was assumed as an axiom, that the Deity is to be propitiated by some human sacrifice—by some mental or physical agony—some painful mortification—by animal blood, or tears, or groans—by something thought, said, suffered, or done by sinful man.

The capital mistake, in one sentence, is and was, That the devout men of all religions are ever seeking to reconcile God to them by something wrought in them or done by them; while God is beseeching men to be reconciled to him through Jesus Christ.

The axiom of the Apostles was, "God is by Christ reconciling a world to himself." The axiom of all human religions is, "Man by his works must reconcile God to himself."

Salvation to be received, not purchased—to be enjoyed, not merited, by obeying the gospel, was set forth from the word of reconciliation, as explained 2 Cor. v.

After this address, supposing the audience to be disabused of numerous mistakes on the subject of religion, we tendered an invitation to any who believed the glad tidings, to submit to the institution of Jesus. Dr. Garlick, of Ohio, now attending his last course of lectures

in the Medical School of this city, led the way; and six others seized the opportunity of coming forward to confess the Lord. The seven were immersed on Monday morning, by our brother Dr. Hall, on the ancient confession.

On Monday evening the constitutional principles of the government of the Messiah were laid before the audience, and some remarks offered on the cavils of sceptics.

On Tuesday evening our topics were various difficulties and objections propounded by the doubting and undecided. After the discourse two persons came forward to confess the Lord. These also were immersed into the faith once delivered to the saints.

In some of the Atlantic cities (perhaps, in all of them) there appears to be a great neglect on the part of the Baptists in making provision for the accommodation of those who are desirous of confessing the Lord. While immense sums are spent in decorating meeting-houses, erecting fine pulpits, and gorgeous cushions for downy Doctors, who are more like the High Priests of Pagan superstition, than the humble disciples of him who had not where to lay his head—there is not a shilling spent in erecting public baths, or baptistries, for the protection of delicate males and females from the inclemencies of the weather, or from the unmeritorious drudgery of walking two or three miles to get out of the way of sailors and draymen. I know, indeed, that some two or three meeting-houses have got in them baptistries; but they are private property, and even these are not of the proper construction. Why could not all those who believe in one immersion, unite in erecting one convenient house for this purpose, with suitable rooms and preparations for dressing? Would it be unbecoming them to co-operate thus far, or to have so much fellowship with one another, as to go to the same element in the same place? Nothing of this sort has yet been attempted; and a superstitious notion that the immerser must himself always accompany the immersed into the water, because, on one occasion, where circumstances made it necessary, Philip waded into the water to immerse the Ethiopian officer—prevents the erection of proper baths even where it was not thought sinful to depart from a river. Baths might be constructed with perfect adaptation to the convenience of both the immerser and the immersed, in which the ordinance might be observed without the immersion of more than the hands of the immerser. If we thought any one imagined that the immersion of part of the body of the immerser was a part of the institution, we might be induced to offer a few reflections on the subject, tending to show that the attitude, or immersion in whole or in part, of the administrator, as he is called, is no part of the institution, and not essential to valid and scriptural immersion: but as we know of no such case, it would be a work of supererrogation to volunteer on such a question.*

*A gentleman has just now said that he was immersed in a river, and that he knew many were so attached to a river, that they would not consider themselves scripturally immersed unless it were done in a river. 'Why not,' I added, 'go to the Jordan?' Bonaparte, or some King of France, some years since, if I am not mistaken, sent to the Jordan for a bottle of water to christen his son! Was not this in the same spirit?

In all the cities of the union it is, I presume, quite practicable for those who agree on this sacred and significant institution, to have a public convenience of this sort, accessible to all the baptizers. Many of the logical and rhetorical guns of the Paidobaptists would, moreover, be dismounted by such a rational and benevolent contrivance.

On the Sabbath, or seventh day, we went to the Jewish synagogue in Baltimore, and were very courteously received by the sons of Abraham according to the flesh, having a letter of introduction to one of the principal members of the synagogue. We were furnished with copies of the readings and prayers for the day. As it was in the days of the Messiah, so is it now in regard to the reading of the ancient Scriptures. The Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms are divided into 52 lessons, so that the whole may be read through once every year. In the language of Abraham the whole services of the day are performed. But, in all candor and honesty, we must say, that, of all the meagre and lifeless forms of religion, without the semblance of the power of truth, which we have witnessed, this bears the palm. It was with mingled emotions of sorrow and astonishment that we witnessed this display of heartless and spiritless formality. The glory is evidently departed. The imprecation of the fathers who repudiated the Messiah, has fallen upon their devoted children. To see them in their prayers, muttered without a single attribute of apparent sincerity, turning their faces and bowing to the East—to hear them with the breathless rapidity of a race-horse, repeating the lessons for the day—with their shoulders covered with linen ephods, fringed with blue threads, indicative of their professed veneration for the law—recalled to our remembrance so many of the denunciations and predictions of their own Moses and the Prophets, that we could not but feel, with deeper convictions, the force of all that Paul quoted and applied to such of the nations as rejected the mission of Jesus. A more lamentable picture of a people forsaken of God and given over to obduracy and impenitence, I could not imagine. Assuredly blindness and the spirit of slumber has fallen upon them. They seemed to be greatly relieved when they had despatched the task of the day.

The females sit by themselves in a sort of outer court, separated by a sort of paling. The readers of the lessons stand in a sort of holy place; and east of them stands the wretched image of the holiest of all. There is the roll of the law, and a few symbols of the furniture of the Sanctum Sanctorum. In prayer and in chanting the Psalms, as well as reading the law, the males wear their hats, and every thing is done in such style that one seems perplexed to decide whether it is designed as a satire upon the Jewish worship, or an expression of respect for the religion of their fathers.

On Thursday evening, before my departure from Baltimore, we addressed the brethren at a private meeting, on the necessity of every Christian being always prepared to give a reason of the hope which he entertains, with meekness and reverence.

EDITOR.

Philadelphia, Dec. 16, 1833.

Turning out the Apostles.

ONE of the most appropriate designings in the various models of architecture in the church building department in the city of N. York, is to be seen at St. Paul's Church, Broadway. Whether by accident or design in the plan of the chief architect, one thing is certain—he has most symbolically, graphically, and emphatically pictured out the truth. On the *outside* of the church, in a very substantial and plain niche, facing the great thoroughfare, there stands in marble the great Apostle. He seems greatly offended at being turned out of doors; has his parchments under his arm, and his staff in his hand, as if hasting out of the walls of the cathedral. The little old man appears care-worn, and vexed with what he has seen within; and seems to cast an eye to heaven, welcoming the peltings of the storm rather than the mummery and the mockery of the blind adoration and insulting homage of wood and stone, instead of the religious obedience of men and women to his Master, through the traditions which he was commanded to deliver to the church of Christ.

The Apostles, indeed, are turned out of all the fashionable churches in all the Atlantic cities, as far as we are able to judge. They are not only exiled from the great cathedrals with crosses and cowls, from the St. Paul's, the St. Peter's, the St. John's, and the Christ's Churches of English and Roman episcopacy; but from the religious theatres of the younger daughters of the Scarlet Lady. Thousands of dollars are squandered in all the pomp and pageantry of the pride of life, to beautify and adorn masses of brick and stone, rather than to cover the nakedness and to feed and educate the inmates of "the sordid huts of cheerless poverty." Pulpits built of mahogany, cushioned and crimsoned in all the gorgeousness of unblushing pride, like inner temples, costing from two to three thousand dollars, environ the object of their adoration—encircle the golden altar on which they present their weekly oblations to that god who delights in a splendid house—in the ornaments of crimsom and scarlet—in gold and silver—in the melodies of organs, and the sounds of unbelieving and unsanctified choristers, more than in the incense of a grateful heart, 'whose fragrance smells to heaven.'

From all that appears within these costly domes and chapels—from all that is seen or heard in them, one never could learn that "God is spirit, and that they who worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." Such a truth, should it happen to escape the lips of any old-fashioned preacher, sounds like a paradox, when echoed from "the long-drawn aisles and fretted vaults" of these worldly sanctuaries. Every thing here is unique and correspondent. The priest enthroned under his canopy of ecclesiastic state, kneels or stands on the pride of life; while nearest his pavilion sit the prime ministers of his dominions. These are the more wealthy members of the community. They, too, make their fortunes minister to their comfort. Kneeling on cushioned footstools, they are more devout than those in their rear; who, as they recede from the pulpit, equally recede from the golden sanctity of their superiors. Behind the door

the sexton or some of the poor servants of the rich bend their knees on the hard oak, in token of their rank in Christ's kingdom. Thus the god of this world outrivals the God that is above, and, by the charms of this world, usurps and occupies the very houses professedly built for those who worship through him who was born in a stable.

No wonder, then, that the Apostle's doctrine and traditions are out of fashion in these cities. Out of fashion they certainly are. The very best preachers are ashamed of them. My friend Dr. Brantly is now reforming his meeting-house. He could not reform the people. He found he had no strength to plead for the Apostles. But he and the people can pull down the old pulpit and the old pews—they can paint and decorate the walls of the pews and the pulpit, and thus reform the house without the aid of one of the Apostles. This CHURCH will soon be reformed, and with what pleasure and *decent* pride can the Doctor and the Deacons unite in all the pageantry and glory of Mammon! Not a member of his church that cannot tell how many cents make a dollar; but how few of them can tell who wrote the Acts of the Apostles, and how many independent authors are bound together in the volume called the New Testament, he and I would be ashamed to tell!

My worthy friend in Baltimore, too, has had his pulpit reformed. Before it was reformed I had the pleasure of telling who Peter was; but since the reformation of the pulpit, he prudently thought that Peter had no business there, and therefore kindly informed me the keys were no longer at his girdle. Fifty-one thousand dollars are absorbed in this temple. The ghosts of twenty-two thousand of them yet haunt the pulpit and the pews. The most terrific spectres are often seen in open day. It is discovered that the hammer of the Sheriff alone can allay their resentment. It will, therefore be applied according to law in some three moons more. These twenty-two thousand ghosts have scared the Twelve Apostles from the lot; yet in their absence our friend of the pulpit says many good things concerning them. Many of his weekly hearers admire the Apostles much, and would like to allure them into the house; but neither the prayers of my friend nor of his good hearers can reconcile them to consort with these twenty-two thousand ghosts.

A very eloquent brother and his accomplished lady, in New York, have great power over these spectres. His private mansion, ornamented by the most refined taste and the good fashion of his *economical* lady, would please Lord Bolingbroke or Mr. Volney in their most fastidious moments. Recently he fell in arrears some six or eight thousand dollars on account of himself and friends. He told his congregations that unless they could placate these fiends, he must obey a call sent by them to a more luxuriant and less haunted soil. They very obsequiously doubled the pew rents, raised the sum, and dispossessed six thousand demons by a single vote. Some of the sisters, affrighted at this legion, screamed out that Mrs. C —— was extravagantly fond of the science of demonology, and if not cured of her fine taste and gaiety of life, it would be of no use to dispossess

these demons; for six thousand more would soon fill the house, now empty, swept, and *richly furnished.* The good preacher, with all the gallantry of his former years, assured the sisters their fears were groundless; for that his good wife was not more fascinated with the love of demons than she ought to be. After castigating them very courteously for their temerity, he admonished them that women's tongues of aspen leaves were made, and that their safety still in silence lay. His predecessor, the good old Welsh Williams, now reposes under the turf, and that humble generation that associated with him have gone the way of all the earth. A Pharaoh that knew not Joseph now occupies the throne. This only proves that the Baptist system, humble as it once was, knows an opportunity, and can seize it too, to ride in state, and dance in silver slippers to the tune of "Every dog has his day."

This is all good orthodox doctrine; and ten to one that I shall become doubly heterodox for insinuating that all these things are not as they ought to be. It will be said that I am unsound on the doctrine of regeneration, because I doubt the Christianity of a Bishop, or a Bishop's lady, who pleads for all that insatiate vanity can claim under the imposing name of "decency." Decency it may be; but, if Jesus Christ spoke the truth, Christianity it is not. The distance between such a decent lady and her Lord and the humblest Christian in New York, is more than half the distance between the upper and nether regions of Hesiod's imagination. There is no one point of intercommunity, and therefore they wisely avoid each other's company. Yet the humblest Christian in that city is the one with whom Gabriel would lodge if ever he should be sent on an errand thither—else he has changed his views since the canon of the Apostles' doctrine closed.

This pride of life, these lusts of the flesh, these lusts of the eye are at war with all that is in heaven, and all that descends from heaven is at war with them. If any one be in Christ he is a new creature—old things are passed away—all things are become new. This is our doctrine of reformation, renovation, regeneration; but it is heterodoxy rank and dangerous! Reader, take heed!

The morals of Christians, rather than their opinions, must have more attention. While Christians live in this world they will live in different circumstances. But no Christian, in any circumstances, can forget that he that panders to the pride of life, is not a believer in the apostolic adage, that "the friendship of the world is enmity with God;" and that "whosoever will be a friend to the world is the enemy of God."

The Apostles are turned out of all doors, public and private, where they could not lodge comfortably in their own persons were they now on earth. That Paul or Peter could feel at home, with his former views while on earth, in any of the Protestant sects, I presume no one can imagine. Indeed, these sects would feel uncomfortable themselves in close company with the Apostles. They do not love any one who comes in their name alone.

Mr. Archibald M'Clay, of New York, formerly one of my warmest

friends, positively refused me his house, because I came not in the name of a Regular Baptist. He told me that I once preached in his hearing "the true grace of God"—"sovereign grace;" but he had *heard*—yes, he had *heard*, that I had departed from the faith. "What faith," said I. "Have you heard me yourself?" "No—no." "Have you read any thing I have written on the faith, or the true grace of God?" "No—no." "How, then, do you know?" "I have heard—I have heard from those who read"! "Is common report the rule of your judgment—the standard by which you estimate principle and character?" "You are not in full fellowship with the Baptists." "But," replied I, "do you receive no one into your house not in full fellowship with the Baptists?" "I think," replies Archibald, "you had better get the Masonic Hall. It is an excellent place." "Better," said I, "*better* for what purpose?—For you, for me, for the citizens?" [No reply.] "It is for your sake as much as for my own, that I wish you to act wisely in this matter. You confer no favor on me—it is the public. Your character is at stake. You could do no more to a Jew, a Turk, an infidel, than to say, It is better for you to go to the Masonic Hall! Must I thus be regarded by one who professes the same faith and the same views of church order! "It is better for you to go to the Masonic Hall." Thus ended the interview.———The secret was, Archibald and the other Baptist preachers had agreed, as report says, to shut their houses and the ears of the people, if they could, against me, because I affirm that the Apostles are to be heard in all things, *even where they are opposed to the Baptist creed*, as well as where they are opposed to any other. But, of my friend Archibald and the shutting out of the Apostles, we may, perhaps, say something more.

EDITOR.

Signs of the Times.

[CONTINUED.]

UPON moral principles this son of perdition cannot be destroyed and "his body given to the burning flame;" it can be nothing but the physical hand of God avenging the blood of his saints, and no doubt will make the seat of antichrist a monument of divine displeasure to the end of time.

The fourth great item in this vision is, the coming of the Son in the clouds of heaven. "I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven," &c. "And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him." As before observed, this is the beginning prophecy relative to the coming of the Son of Man "with the clouds of heaven." Now if the Bible be true, and no deception intended to be practised on the credulity of the reader, a like passage must have a like meaning. This at once will be admitted by plain honest common sense. Prove to me that Scripture, plainly

and truly similar in phrase, has a different meaning, and you thus far weaken my confidence in the sacred pages. There is no book more consistent with itself, and farther from double meanings.

If our proposition be substantiated, every passage in the Old or New Testament, wherein the Son of Man is represented as coming with the clouds of heaven, must correspond in meaning with this prediction of Daniel; and what sophistry can transfer it to the worlds above, or to the final judgment? "And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him." Reader, think you, are there to be nations and languages after the final judgment? And if this coming in the clouds of heaven is to take place at the final judgment, then, and at that time, he is to receive dominion over people, nations, and languages! Who would suppose that there is to be the present endless diversities of languages and nations in another state of existence? The Son of Man is to receive dominion over nations. There must be a plain difference in language, law, Lord, or territory, before you can make nations. Nations must exist in their diversity of language, complexion, manners, and locality, as long as time lasts—until we put on immortality. And it is just as unreasonable to think they will be known in a state of immortality, or to think they can cease to be in a state of mortality. And this very kingdom that Christ is coming in the clouds of heaven to receive, is to be consummated on nations, on men in the flesh, speaking different languages and inhabiting different sections of the earth; and it must take place at least a thousand years before the close of time.

There is another item in the vision, quite as irreconcileable to the end of time as the above. I have touched on the subject before. Suppose the "horn" spoken of in the vision is a figure of antichrist, or the imperial authority which rose in the church. This horn is to reign and make war on the saints till the close of time, or this very judgment spoken of must take place long before the end of all things. "I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints and prevailed against them, until the Ancient of days came." Now if this vision has a reference to the era of time, then is the reign of Christ entirely excluded, or he must divide territory with the son of perdition; for the son of perdition is to reign till the sitting of this very judgment; and Christ, according to prophecy, is to reign at least one thousand years; and in this reign there is to be nothing to hurt or offend. Our Divines should straighten up these things, or hush trumpeting their absurdities round the world. If Christ is to reign a thousand years, was he reigning previous to this time? If he was, why is the thousand years specified? Specifying a thousand years of reign, precludes the idea of a reign from the years which have preceded it. The present dispensation, therefore, may not be considered a reign. Nor was it intended by the Master that his followers should rule. They are taught obedience; and notorious fact says that every solitary instance where the church has wormed itself into power, it has always been abused and used to the unavoidable ruin of vital piety. It is impossi-

ble to amalgamate the government of Christ and that of the world. The unavoidable consequence is, that an antichristian authority and spirit are engendered. This is not said to the disparagement of the Christian religion; but as showing the legitimate consequence of violating the constituted law of the Master. I fearlessly assert it, that the church is antichristian which is ruling, or that which is wedded to the civil power, or thirsting for establishment. The church has never legislated but to the ruin of religion. A national religion is an antichristian religion, find it where you will. I admit that Christ is reigning over a few individuals, but not over one solitary nation; nor can he, until there is a radical change in all government, religious and political—aye, and the subjects too. And every human effort to exalt him above the nations, will be attended with disappointment and danger. When the followers of Christ occupy forbidden ground, can they expect success? Yet the Messiah is to reign over the nations "in his times," but not in these times. It is contrary to the constituted laws of this dispensation. And if this reign is to be gradually introduced, as some suppose, how is it to be known that it be in existence? Ages must roll over, without miraculous interposition, before much change to human discernment can be seen. Men are gradually growing worse—more corruption, more murders, thefts, robberies, &c. than were ever recorded, instead of the gradual reign of Christ. A sad reverse is taking place; but our teachers are waiting for the outpouring of the Spirit! Alas! the world is to be ruined while waiting for the outpouring of the Spirit!

In my way I have shown that the coming of the Son of Man must take place at least a thousand years before the close of time. I now propose showing that it must be visible, or it cannot be proven—something on which the senses can act. And my arguments, without paying much regard to method, will, and have been to show, that Christ is to have his kingdom on earth—that his second coming is to be long before the end of time—and that it must be visible to the whole human family. Now every passage in the sacred pages, where the clouds of heaven are called for, must agree in meaning with the vision of Daniel—the same coming, the same clouds, the same kingdom, or there can be no certainty in the whole book. A cloud received the Lord of glory and carried him beyond the reach of human vision—(was this cloud visible?)—and a prediction was left on the very spot relative to his return. "This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as you have seen him go into heaven"—on a cloud, or it will not fulfil the prediction; the scene must be visible, or it cannot be proved; and to receive dominion and glory, according to Daniel. If the orthodox can prove a coming on the clouds at the close of time, I stand pledged, with the help of Daniel and others, to prove such a coming previous to his reign over people, nations, and languages. So there will be two comings on the clouds of heaven proved, if they be correct.

Serious reader, tell me, in the name of common sense, how is Christ to make his spiritual appearance in the clouds of heaven! Surely

our spiritualizers have some way of explaining these things. What! is the church and the clouds of heaven the same thing? Where in the Bible, or out of it, do they find a precedent for such a metamorphosis. If he is to come spiritually in the clouds of heaven, just so did he go; and it was an optical illusion—the disciples were only cheated while gazing toward heaven at their ascending Lord.

In Zechariah, 14th chap. we find a prophecy relative to the return of the Master to this very Mount of Olives. "And his feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem, on the east, and the mount shall cleave in the midst thereof," &c.

We would be glad to see some of the greatest proficients, one who can spiritualize with the greatest dexterity, give the true spiritual meaning of the above quotation.

The latter part of Zechariah is full of important prophecy relative to Jerusalem, the Jews, and others. "And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and supplication; and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him as one mourneth for his only son." Does it not look like the Jews are to inhabit Jerusalem, when this spirit of grace and supplication is to be afforded them? And is this spirit to be poured without means, or by means? In all the field of nature or grace can any one show a solitary instance where God works without means? The orthodox tell us that God can work without means. Does he ever do it? If God has used means in all his works, will he not do so still? Then, what means will God use to produce in the Jews this spirit of grace and supplication? Is the mighty work to be done by argument? What has argument done with a Jew for eighteen hundred years past? He is just left where he was found—an unbelieving Jew. Is the present ratio of light afforded to the moral world, to do more than it has been doing for eighteen hundred years? But the time for the outpouring is not yet come. Then God has been withholding that which might have been afforded, and might have done more for his vineyard than he has done.

We cannot expect, through the medium of the present moral light of the world, that this spirit of grace and supplication is to be afforded the Jews. Demonstration alone can convert a nation in a day—can convert the Jewish people—just such a fact as the one in the prophecy before us.

I believe the Jews are to return to their land in peace; the nations are to surround them; they will be brought to the greatest extremity. At this time a deliverer will appear, who will turn away unrighteousness from Jacob. See Ezek. xxxviii. 11, 12. Zech. xiv. "And the Lord thy God shall come, and all the saints with thee. And the Lord shall be King over all the earth. And in that day shall there be one Lord, and his name one." None of these passages can have a reference to the close of time; the prophecy cannot be strained to such a bearing. Yet the Lord is to "come and all the saints with thee," and be King over all the earth. Can a solitary spot on earth be shown, five miles square, where the Lord is truly and fairly King? Can any

thing short of miracle bring this about—such a one as the coming of the Son of Man?

We will now examine predictions in the New Testament. [See Matth. xxiv.] "For as the lightning cometh out of the east and shineth even unto the west, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be." "And then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven; and then shall the tribes of the earth mourn; and they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory." "But as the days of Noe were, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be." This coming is to be as visible and conspicuous as the lightning's blaze. "Then shall the tribes of the earth mourn." Is this a different mourning from that in Zechariah? And is the power and great glory different from the "dominion and glory" foretold by Daniel? But setting aside all these things, there are considerations inseparably coupled with the prophecy, entirely irreconcileable with the end of time. "But as the days of Noe were, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be." "Then shall two be in the field; the one shall be taken and the other left. Two women shall be grinding at the mill; the one shall be taken, and the other left." How can this apply to the close of time? At the final judgment are any to be left?

As I have already made some remarks on Matth. xxiv. I will pass over to a prediction in the following chapter, no less misapplyed. "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit on the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats," &c. Not one word in the passage about the throne of the Father's glory, nor a word about resurrection, or a dissolution of nature, nor any thing which may not be transacted a thousand years before the end; but a calling the nations—the living, not the dead—to a reckoning.

A judgment has attended the close of every dispensation. A flood closed the first; a dreadful overthrow the second. Nothing but temporal blessings were promised, or temporal punishments threatened, under the Jewish dispensation. The Jewish church underwent a judgment corresponding exactly with the conditions of their covenant—with their faith; so will it be with the present dispensation—a judgment is to sit corresponding with the covenant—with the faith. The nations are to be called to a reckoning; the righteous and wicked separated; the one sentenced to everlasting punishment; the other enters into life eternal.

Can any one prove these things to be impossible? It is much more plausible to expect, at the close of the present dispensation, those who may be found worthy to obtain eternal life, should stand before the Judge and hear the plaudit, "Well done, good and faithful servant! enter into the joy of thy Lord"—than to believe Christ is not to appear till the end of time, and at this end receive dominion over people, nations, languages, and tongues. The one is impossible: the other both possible and probable. As the pulpit is the fountain head of

error, from it has flowed more error on the subject of the judgment than any other, except that of world-burning; and the two are nearly allied.

If I am not mistaken, Newton was of the opinion that the judgment would last a thousand years. This is more reasonable than that it should be transacted in a day. The judgment before us is evidently to be under the superintendance of the Son of Man: "And he shall sit on the throne of his glory." This cannot well have an allusion to the same judgment spoken of in 1st Thess. iv. 14. "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him." The one is Christ revealed on the throne of his glory, at the introduction of his universal reign. The other is Deity unveiling himself at the close of time. We have presented us on the page of prophecy, "a great white throne," &c. "And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God." Now can clerical sophistry make this "great white throne," and that spoken of in Matthew, the same? On the one is seated the Son of Man, judging the nations. The other is "a great white throne," and "the dead, small and great, standing before God." No doubt but the judgment before the one is to take place at the close of the present dispensation—the other, at the close of time.

[*To be continued.*]

For the Millennial Harbinger.

Right of Opinion.

THE following decision of a Dutch Judge, on *the right of opinion*, is so much in unison with the *sectarian judges* of this proscribing age, as to merit a place in some independent and extensively circulating periodical.

In a case before him, in which the *right of opinion* was brought in question, it was argued for the party whose right was questioned, that *in this country every man had a right to express freely his opinions.* To this the JUDGE, WHO IT SEEMS WAS DETERMINED AGAINST THE MAN, replied with great complacency, "O yah! Every man haf a right, by the law, in this free Rebublic, to dink for himself, PROVIDED HE DINKS WITH THE COURT." —[*M'Duffie's Speech.*]

This reminds me of an argument once used by a disciple with the Moderator of the Dover Decrees. The question was asked, "Was it the right of every disciple, as a member of the church of Jesus Christ, to read the Bible?" He answered, "O yes?" "Was it his right to form *his own opinion* of what God had revealed?" "O yes!" he replied. "Was it his right, *as a Christian*, to speak freely the conviction of his own judgment?" "O yes!" said he, "*provided he speak according to the views of the church.* If he did not, the church had rights too; and one of those rights was, to cut off such as *they believed* were in serious error." The question was asked, "If disciples had a

right to read, form their own judgment of the truth, and speak it freely; was not this *admitted right* a warning to him, as a man of righteousness, not to molest them in the enjoyment of their rights? Or was not the man that molested the disciples in the enjoyment of these admitted rights, an unrighteous man?" No answer has ever been given, but by his enforcing the decrees upon those that differed in opinion with him. In such conduct we have a true picture of the life, spirit, righteousness, and consummation of the religion of sectarianism.

T. M. H.



From the Pennsylvania Inquirer.

CHAPLAIN TO CONGRESS.

THE young, but eloquent divine alluded to in the following paragraph, is a native of Philadelphia, if we mistake not, and was several years since a distinguished contributor to the literary periodicals of this city. We know him well know him to be, although a young man, one of superior endowments and unquestionable worth, and qualified in all respects to fill with honor the duties of the station to which he is commended:—

From the National Intelligencer.

One of the earliest, and not the least important, appointments which it will devolve upon Congress to make, will be the selection of a suitable minister to attend that body as Chaplain. In this selection the representatives of the people will, of course, look not so much to the sect, as to the piety, learning, and talents of the reverend gentlemen whose names shall be brought before them as candidates for this honorable and highly important station. If profound biblical learning, soul-stirring eloquence, elevated moral feelings, and pure and irreproachable moral character, is to be the standard by which the clerical claims to this station is to be adjudged, there is no gentleman of the profession who can present to the consideration of Congress more elevated claims for the station than the Rev. Thomas H. Stockton, of the Methodist Protestant Church of Georgetown, D. C. Mr. S. is comparatively a young minister; but his usefulness and popularity have been almost unexampled. Mild in his disposition, modest and unassuming in his demeanor, he is perfectly free from the cant of sectarian bigotry. His sermons are delivered with all the force of original genius, embellished with the sublime decoration of religious truth, and enforced with the true dignity of unaffected piety. If the members of Congress will visit the church of this distinguished clergymen, they cannot but be satisfied that all I have said is but a faint representation of the worth and abilities of Mr. Stockton; and I feel assured that they will concur with one who is not a professor of any religious creed, in the opinion that no clergyman, here or elsewhere, would discharge the duties of Chaplain with more ability, or give more universal satisfaction.

A LISTENER.

Brother Campbell,

THE above is a fair specimen of the Pantheistic religion of the nineteenth century in the New World. Every sect in the religious world has its system to which it does homage; thus love of system, instead of the love of Christ, reigns predominant within. The love of place, however, is even stronger than the love of system, and the sentiments of the above extracts, are a faithful representation of the

religious Pantheism, or sectarian infidelity which prevails, and is so accommodating that the truth shall be told in Congress in so delicate a manner as not to offend the legislative ear polite. Happily, brother, we belong not to the religious world, which is truly a world dead in trespasses and in sins; we claim a higher standing, no less than the citizenship of the *little* kingdom of Jesus, viewed as it *now* is; but, of his great and glorious dominion as it will *hereafter* be. For this let us be thankful and rejoice exceedingly!—What follows will, perhaps, exhibit the foregoing in its true light.

J—— T——, *M. D.*

CHAPLAIN TO THE ROMAN SENATE.

THE young, but eloquent divine alluded to in the following paragraph, is a native of Tarsus, in Cilicia, and was several years since a distinguished scholar, indefatigable student, and zealous champion of the traditions of the Fathers, under Rabbi Gamaliel, D. D. President of the Theological Department of Literature in the City of Jerusalem. We know him well—know him to be, although a young man, one of superior endowments and unquestionable worth, and qualified in all respects to fill with honor the duties of the station to which he is commended:—

From the Roman Annalist.

One of the earliest, and not the least important appointments which will devolve upon the Imperial Senate to make, will be the selection of a suitable Clergyman to attend that august body as High Pontiff of the holy religious mysteries of the nation. In this selection the Conscript Fathers will, of course, look not so much to the sect of worshippers, since the devout of "*every name and denomination*" in the Empire are equally eligible to the "*Holy Office*,"—as to the talents, learning, and piety towards the Immortal Gods of the Reverend Clergy whose names shall be brought before the Inquisitors of the Theological Department of State, as candidates for this honorable and highly important station. If profound rabbinical learning, proficiency in mythologic and sybil lore, soul-stirring and captivating eloquence, high-toned moral feelings, and pure and irreproachable moral character, is to be the standard by which the clerical claims of the pontifical station are to be adjudged, there is no gentleman of the profession who can present to the consideration of the Conscript Fathers more elevated claims for office, than the Rev. Saulus Paulus, of the Pharisaic Jewish Church of Jerusalem, in the province of Judea. Doctor Paul is comparatively a young clergyman; but his usefulness in opposing heresy, his zeal for the law, and popularity with the learned Doctors of the Sanhedrim, have been almost unexampled. Warm-hearted, modest, and unassuming, he is perfectly free from the cant of sectarian bigotry. His sermonical orations are delivered with all the force of *original* genius, EMBELLISHED with the sublime *declaration* of religious truth, and *enforced*, not with incessant quotations from the Apostles and Prophets, but with the true dignity of unaffected piety. If the Conscript Fathers of the Senate of the Roman people will visit

the temple of this distinguished Priest, they cannot but be satisfied that all I have said is but a faint representation of the worth and abilities of the Reverend Saulus Paulus, D. D.; and I feel assured they will concur with one who is a Pantheist, in the opinion that no clergyman, here or elsewhere, would discharge the duties of High Pontiff with more ability, or give more universal satisfaction.

A LISTENER.

Ides of December, A. U. 8, 785.

The Coffee-House at Surat.

AT Surat was a coffee-house, the general rendezvous of strangers after dinner. One afternoon stepped in a Persian Seydre, or Doctor of the Law, who had been writing all his life on theological subjects, who no longer believed in a God. "What is it that you call God?" said he. "Whence comes he? Who made him? Where is he? If he were a body, he would be visible: were he a spirit, he would be intelligent and just; he would not permit so many human beings to be miserable. I myself, after having labored so long in his service, ought to have been High Priest of Ispahan, instead of being forced to flee from Persia, after all my exertions to enlighten mankind. There is no God." Thus the Doctor, misled by ambition, by dint of reasoning on the first reason of all things, had at length lost his own, and imagined, not that it was his own intelligence, which no longer existed, but the intelligence which governs the universe. He had for a slave a Cafre almost naked, whom he left at the door of the coffee-house. For himself, he went and stretched his limbs on a sofa, and took a cup of coquenar or opium. As soon as the fumes of this beverage began to mount his brain, he addressed himself to his slave who was sitting on a stone in the sun, driving away the flies which sucked his blood, in these terms: "Miserable black! Believest thou there is a God?" "Who can doubt it?" replied the Cafre, and as he spake pulled out from a shred of pagne which girded his loins, a little marmouset of wood, and said, "Behold the God who has protected me ever since I came into the world; he is made of a branch of the feticha tree of my country." All the company in the coffee-room were no less surprised at the slave's answer than at his master's question.

On this a Bramin, shrugging up his shoulders, said to the Negro: "Poor idiot! What, carry thy God in thy girdle! Know that there is no other God but Brama, who created the world, and whose temples are on the banks of the Ganges. The Bramins are his only priests, and it is under his special protection that they subsist for a hundred and twenty thousand years past, in defiance of all the revolutions which India has undergone." A Jew broker immediately took him up, saying: "How can the Bramins believe that God has temples only in India, and that he exists for their caste only? There is no God but the God of *Abraham*, and he has no other people but that of *Israel*.

He preserves them, though dispersed over the whole earth, till he shall gather them together again at Jerusalem, to give them the empire of the nations, when they shall have there rebuilt his Temple, formerly the wonder of the universe." As he pronounced these words, tears started to the Israelite's eyes. He was going to resume his speech, when an Italian in a blue robe interrupted him in great heat: "You make God unjust," said he, "in pretending that he loves only the people of Israel. He had rejected them for more than seventeen hundred years past, as is evident from their very dispersion. He is now calling all men into the Roman Catholic Church, beyond the pale of which there can be no salvation." A Protestant minister of the Danish Mission at Tranquebar, growing pale as ashes, replied to the Popish Missionary: "How dare you limit the salvation of mankind to your idolatrous communion? Learn that none can be saved but those who, conformably to the gospel, worship God in spirit and in truth, under the law of Jesus Christ." Upon this a Turk, an officer of the customs at Surat, who was smoking his pipe, said with a grave air to the two Christians: "Fathers, how can you confine the knowledge of God to your churches? The law of *Jesus* has been abolished ever since *Mahomet* appeared, the paraclet predicted by Jesus Christ himself the word of God. Your religion no longer subsists except in a few kingdoms, and upon its ruins ours has extended itself over the finest provinces of Europe, of Africa, of Asia and her islands. It is at this day seated on the throne of the Great Mogul, and is penetrating into China, that enlightened country. You yourselves discern the rejection of the Jews, in their present state of humiliation; acknowledge, then, the mission of the Prophet in his triumphs. The followers of *Mahomet* and of *Omar* alone can be saved; for the disciples of *Ali* are infidels." At these words the Seydre, who was of Persia, where the people are of the sect of Ali, began to smile; but a great tumult arose in the coffee-house, from the variety of strangers assembled, who were of as many different religions; and among the rest Abyssinian Christians, Cophts, Tartarian Lamas, Arabian Ishmaelites, and Guebres, or worshippers of fire. All these disputed on the nature of God, and on the worship he required, every one maintaining that the true religion existed no where but in his own country.

There was in the coffee-house a man of letters from China, a disciple of Confucius, who was travelling for his improvement. He sat in a corner of the room, drinking tea, and listening to all that was said, without speaking a word. The Turkish custom-house officer turning to him, cried aloud, "My good Chinese, who remainest silent, you know that many religions have made their way into China. The merchants of your country who had occasion here for my services have told me so, and assured me that the religion of Mahomet is the best. Like them do justice to the truth: what is your opinion of God, and the religion of his Prophet?" This produced a profound silence in the coffee-room. The disciple of Confucius, drawing back his hands into the large sleeves of his robe, and crossing them on

his breast, retired into himself, and in a gentle and deliberate accent thus spake:—

"Gentlemen, if I may be permitted to say so, it is ambition which in every case hinders men to agree: if you will give me a patient hearing, I shall produce an instance of this which is still fresh in my memory. When I left China, on my voyage to Surat, I embarked on board an English ship which had sailed round the world. On our passage we cast anchor on the eastern coast of Sumatra. Towards noon, having gone ashore in company with several persons belonging to the vessel, we went and sat down on the shore of the sea, near a little village, under the shade of some cocoa trees, where men of different countries were enjoying their repose. A blind man came and joined the company: he had lost his sight by too close a contemplation of the sun. He had been actuated by the wild ambition of comprehending the nature of that luminary, in order to appropriate his light to himself. He had tried all the methods which optics, chemistry, and even necromancy can supply, to shut up one of his rays in a bottle. Not being able to succeed, he said, 'The light of the sun is not a fluid, for it cannot be agitated by the wind; it is not a solid, for the parts of it cannot be separated; it is not fire, for it is not extinguishable in water; it is not a spirit, as it is visible; it is not a body, for we cannot handle it; it is not even a moving power, for it agitates not the lightest bodies: it is, therefore, nothing at all.' Finally, by persevering efforts, in contemplating the sun, and reasoning on his light, he at length lost his eye-sight, and what is worse, his reason. He believed that it was not his vision, but the sun which had no existence in the universe. He had a Negro to lead him about, who having seated his master under the shade of a cocoa tree, picked up one of its nuts that lay on the ground, and set about making a lamp of the shell, a wick of the outer husk, and squeezed a little oil from the kernel to put into his lamp. While the black man was thus employing himself, his blind master said to him with a sigh, 'Is there, then, no such thing as light in the world?' 'Yes, that of the sun,' replied the Negro. 'What is it you call the sun?' resumed the blind man. 'I cannot tell,' answered the African; 'all I know is, that his rising is the commencement of my labors, and his setting he termination of them. His light interests me less than my lamp, which illuminates my cottage; without it I should not be able to serve you during the night.' Then, holding out his little cocoa shell, said, 'There is my sun!' At this part of the conversation a man of the village, who walked on crutches, fell a laughing; and believing that the blind man had been so from his birth, said to him, 'Know that the sun is a globe of fire which rises every day out of the ocean, and sets every night toward the West, in the mountains of Sumatra. You would see this yourself, as we all do, had you the blessing of sight.' Here a fisherman interposed, and said to the cripple, 'It is easy to perceive that you have never travelled far beyond the limits of your village. If you had legs, and could have made the tour of Sumatra, you must have known that the sun does not set in its mountains; but

he issues every morning out of the sea, and dips into it again every evening to cool himself: this is what I see every day along the coasts of the island.' An inhabitant of the Peninsula of India then said to the fisherman, 'How is it possible for a man of common sense to believe that the sun is a globe of fire, and that he every day issues from the ocean, and plunges into it at night without extinguishing himself? Learn, then, that the sun is a Denta or Divinity of my country, that he rides every day through the heavens in a chariot, turning round the golden mountain of Merowa; that when he undergoes an eclipse, it is owing to his being swallowed up by the serpents Ragon and Ketou, from which he is delivered only by the prayers of the Indians on the banks of the Ganges. It is a very ridiculous ambition for an inhabitant of Sumatra to pretend that he shines only on the horizon of his island; it could have entered in the head only of a man whose navigation has been limited to the paddling of a canoe.' A Lascar, the master of a trading vessel that lay at anchor, then spoke to this purpose: 'It is an ambition still more ridiculous to imagine that the sun prefers India to all the countries of the world. I have navigated through the Red Sea, along the coasts of Arabia, to Madagascar, to the Moluccas, and to the Philippine Islands: the sun enlightens all those countries as well as India. He does not turn round a mountain; but rises in the islands of Japan, which are for that reason called Jepon, or Ge-puen, *the Birth of the Sun*, and he sets very far to the west, behind the islands of England. I am very sure of it, for I have heard it related by my grandfather, when I was a child, and he had sailed to the very extremities of the ocean.' He was going to proceed, when an English seaman of our ship's company interrupted him thus: 'There is no country where the course of the sun is better known than in England: be assured, then, that he no where rises or sets. He is incessantly making the circuit of the globe; and I am perfectly sure of it, for we have just performed the same round, and have met him wherever we went.' Then taking a ratan from the hand of one of his auditors, he traced a circle on the sand, endeavoring to explain to them the course of the sun from tropic to tropic; but not being able to make it out, he appealed to the testimony of the pilot of his ship, for the truth of every thing he would have said. This pilot was a wise man, who had heard the whole dispute without interposing a single word; but when he perceived that all the company kept silence to hear him, he spoke to this effect: 'Each of you is trying to mislead others, and is himself misled. The sun does not turn round the earth; it is the earth which turns round him, presenting in succession, every twenty-four hours, the islands of Japan, the Philippines, the Moluccas, Sumatra, Africa, Europe, England, and a great many other countries. The sun shines not for one mountain only, one island, one horizon, one sea, nor even for one globe; but he is at the centre of the universe, from whence he illuminates, together with the earth, five other planets which likewise revolve around him, and of which some are much greater than our globe, and at a much greater distance than it is from the sun. Such is, among others, Saturn, of

30,000 leagues diameter, and at the distance of 285,000,000 of leagues from the sun. I say nothing of the moons which reflect on planets remote from the sun his light, and are not few in number. Every one of you would have an idea of these truths, if he only turned his eyes in the night toward the heavens, and if he had not the ambition of believing that the sun shines for his own country only.' Thus spake, to the great astonishment of his hearers, the pilot who had steered a ship round the world, and observed the starry heavens.

"It is equally true of God," continued the disciple of Confucius, "as of the sun: every man believes he possesses him exclusively, in his own chapel, or at least in his own country. The people of every nation believe they have enclosed in their temples him whom the visible universe cannot contain. Is there, however, a temple once to be compared with that which God himself has reared for collecting all mankind into one and the same communion? All the temples in the world are made only in imitation of that of nature. We find in most of them lavers, holy water cisterns, columns, arches, lamps, statues, inscriptions, books of the law, sacrifices, altars, and priests. But what temple contains a cistern so vast as the ocean, which is not to be contracted to a shell? Where do we find columns so beautiful as the trees of the forest, or those of the orchard loaded with fruits? Where an arch so lofty as the vault of heaven, and a lamp so bright as the sun? Where shall we behold statues so interesting as a multitude of human beings who love each other, assist each other, talk one to another? Where inscriptions so intelligible, and more religious than the bounties of nature herself? A book of the law so universal as the love of God founded on a sense of gratitude, and as the love of our fellow-creatures founded on our best interest? What sacrifices more affecting than those of our praises to him who has given us all things, and of our passions, for the sake of those with whom we are bound to share all that we have? Where, finally, shall we look for an altar so sacred as the heart of the good man, whose High Priest is God himself? Thus, the farther that man extends the power of Deity, the more nearly will he approach to the knowledge of him; and the greater indulgence he shows to men, the more closely will he imitate the divine goodness. Let him, therefore, who enjoys the light of God diffused over the whole universe, beware of despising the poor superstitious creature, who perceives only a little ray of it in his idol; or even the Atheist who is totally destitute of it, lest as a punishment of his pride, he should be made to partake of the fate of that philosopher, who, attempting to appropriate to himself the light of the sun, became blind, and felt himself reduced, in order to find his way, to employ the lamp of a Negro."

Thus spake the disciple of Confucius, and all the company in the coffee-house who had been contending for the excellency of their several religions, maintained a profound silence.

[*Studies of Nature.*]

From the Philadelphia Recorder.

Proofs of the Deluge.

THE whole religion of Greece was borrowed from the theology of Egypt, Chaldea, and Phœnicia. The Ark was represented by a variety of emblematical animals, while Noah was usually considered as the allegorical consort of the Ark.

The term by which the Phœnicians described a decked or covered ship was, almost without variation, applied by the Greeks to one of the animals emblematical of the Ark. (Hippa, from Hipha)—Argos, or the city of the Ark, was perpetually, by the old mythologists, styled Hippian; and it was so styled, says Hesychus, from Hippa, the allegorical daughter of Danaus or Da Nau. This Hippa was nurse of Noah, or, in plain language, the Ark.

The Gothic, the Grecian, the Egyptian, and the Hindoo mythologies, alike suppose giants to have existed at the time of the deluge. These were the irreclaimable antediluvians; and, as such, are said in the *Edda*, to have been swept away by the waters of a flood.

The *princely Noah*, the *illustrious solar Noah*, the *decked Ark*, the *Noetic Sun*, the *Arkite*, *Noah the god of the lake*, the *divine Ark*, and a multitude of similar phrases, are preserved in the ancient mythologies, and constantly presented to our view in names of gods, goddesses, nymphs, &c.—though, from their being expressed in Grecian and other languages, foreign to our own, we do not advert to it. The *great arkite mother* is a title of Venus. Venus itself means *the Ark*. Dardanus, *the illustrious Noah*.

The worship of the sun and moon, and of Noah, his family, and the Ark, were, as has been observed, the two earliest forms of idolatry. The union of these two forms produced the double allusion found in many of the ancient names. Thus, the *solar deity Noah*, the *arkite crescent*, &c.—referring at once to the sun and to Noah—to the moon and to the ark.

The *deity of the Hippian Ark* is one of the titles of Mercury.

Some of the legends of Grecian mythology, evidently founded on the circumstance of the deluge, are recorded in the Hindoo books.

We must attribute to something more than accident the preservation of the names of Noah and the Ark, in such a multitude of instances, in the ancient languages. Atalanta, consort to Hippomenes, the arkite Menes, is the *divine ship of the sun*—Euhippa (the beautiful Hippa, or Ark.) Chrysippa, (the golden Hippa, or Ark.) Glaucippa, (the sea-green Hippa, or Ark.) Iphince —Ipha-Noe, the *ark of Noah*—Hippo or Hippa, the Ark.

The mysteries of the ancients alluded partly to the history of the deluge, and partly to the solar superstition, so early engrafted upon the history of the Ark.

The goblet was dedicated to Bacchus, not merely because he was considered the father of vineyards, but because he was said to have sailed in one. The same thing is said of Hercules. Both these personages were evidently memorials of Noah. A slight examination is sufficient to show this.

One practice in the ancient world appears to have been very general, viz.—taking a variety of facts, which equally concerned the whole world, and incorporating them with local history. Every neighborhood, and every nation, however unimportant in the great scale, thus strove to make itself distinguished. Thus, the expedition of the Argonauts is not only spoken of by the Greeks, but the knowledge of it was generally diffused. The story, therefore, had its origin in some circumstance common to all; though the embellishments added by the Greeks, were peculiar to themselves. At the time the voyage is said to have occurred, the Greeks were, comparatively, barbarians, unknown to the extensive empires of the East; and an insulated adventure of of a few of them in a single ship would hardly have been known to the Hindoos, the Medes, the Persians, and the Egyptians.

It is a tradition of the Hindoos that Noah built the ark on the summit of a mountain, in their country, called Chaisa-ghar, and there embarked; also, that when the flood assuaged, the summit of that mountain first appeared above the waters, and was the resting place of the dove.

They say that Shama, or Shem, travelled first to the north-east, and then turning to the north-west, arrived on the spot where he built afterwards the town of Bamiyan—*the high place of the dove.*

They, moreover, say that their sacred books speak of the place where the ark was first made fast. In Cashmire is a famous peak, whose name literally signifies *to bind fast a ship*, and it is resorted to by pilgrims from all parts of India, who fancy that the doves there, flying from rock to rock, are their guides to the spot where the ark rested.

Such circumstances as these certainly had some greater origin than chance. Perverted as they are, and mingled with fable, they are rays emanating from the truth as described by Moses.

A Hint to the Disciples.

BALTIMORE, December 31, 1833.

Beloved Brother,

WISHING you grace, mercy, and peace from God the Father and Jesus Christ our Lord—I am much delighted to find you still contending for the truth. May the Lord Jesus bless you abundantly in all your efforts, whether in speaking or writing, with great success! Dear brother, the reformation in which you are engaged is about to take a character unto itself, and like all other moral, political, or religious fabrics, will become permanent; whatever form, therefore, it receives in its establishment, it will wear for ages. Of how great importance, then, is it that it be formed in all its parts exactly like the original ancient heavenly structure erected in Jerusalem! And as the symmetry of every building depends, in a great degree, upon the fitness and coherence of its several component parts, what attention ought to be paid to the spiritual stones of which the kingdom of our Lord is made up! Philosophy fails to show upon what principles the varied intellects, feelings, and propensities of men can be united in religious matters. But Jesus our King has brought light into the world, and has exhibited a way, which, for its simplicity and admirable adaptation to the desired end, far surpasses every scheme the world ever saw.

There is one thing I fear very much—and that is, a disputatious spirit among the brethren, and a dry, formal, intellectual worship, performed in an insipid and indifferent manner. I have seen things in some places looking this way. Indeed, it would appear to be the only consistent course, did we, as other reformers do, avoid those things which others perform, and perform what others avoid. They who come over from a noisy, irregular, and external form of worship, are too apt to place reform in being singularly quiet and contemplative; and where animal excitement has been mistaken for true devotion, reform is too likely to consist in eradicating the feelings altogether. Ah me! we are so prone to extremes. Lord have mercy upon

us! I am very sorry when I see reformers stumping on their exploits in repartee, or lucidly holding forth some trite saying, or quiz, by which they have overturned a poor sectarian. In my soul I pity such large spirits. Brother C. this is not the way to convert the world. The religion of Jesus Christ is neither head religion nor heart religion; but it is the religion of the whole man. Some people place the all-important matter in faith; others, in virtue. But the Christian's duty is neither the one nor the other exclusively—it is composed of faith and virtue. The man who can split hairs in doctrine, or describe the way perspicuously, without walking in it—who can show the nature of volition, and the power of testimony; and yet does not fall practically under the influence of the gospel, has, perhaps, caused the cant retort of the opposers of this reformation, that *ours is head religion.* For my own part, I delight to theorize with the lovers of theory; to talk experimentally with the admirers of experience; and to be found foremost in good works with those who love practical godliness. With the first, however, I do not speculate about the five points; but show systematically the plan of redemption; with the second I talk of having experienced the fulfilment of God's promises, upon sincere obedience—that I have always found him as good as his word, &c. and to the last, have shown that good works are deeds of benevolence, or kindness done to others, whether to our brethren or the world;—that the quarrel of the Calvinistic and Arminian schools has arisen from a misapprehension of the Scriptures; good works are exclusively performed to the necessitated; therefore, the worship of God is not works, so to speak; he needs nothing from our hands. Each of these matters deserves an essay.

Another matter, however, I would notice, relative to a right use of terms in this reformation. How much injury has been done, and how many people have been stumbled by the word *regeneration!* When we do not use a popular term in the popular sense, we ought to explain ourselves. The people, generally, think regeneration to be a change of heart by the Holy Spirit. 'But,' says a reformer, 'baptism is regeneration.' 'Therefore,' say the people, 'you believe that baptism changes the heart!!' Again, the word *preacher* is often the cause of mistake, because it is used by reformers without explanation; and the people, of course, associate with the term all their ideas of special calling, messenger of God, ordained, holy man. When a reformer tells his neighbor we are all preachers—the whole church are preachers, he may well say, 'Monstrous arrogance! Deluded people!' I say, ditabuse the public mind; but the above course is abusive in the extreme. I know a good many folks who try to bring down the high standing of the sectarian preacher by endeavoring to associate themselves with them; but there is a wide difference between a primitive preacher and a modern functionary who wears that name. The first was the servant of the church—the messenger of the church, and was sent by the church whithersoever they pleased; but the last is a lord over the heritage—a ruler—a father—a guide to the whole people. Do not tell me that a talented brother who preaches at home as far as

his circumstances will admit, is a preacher; or that the church to which he belongs, holds forth the word of life by his means. Although this is just as money lovers would have it, he will have his reward for his labor. But the church has no right to the reward unless they support him in the work. Then the work is theirs, and not his. But, alas! for the people! Mammon, that God of the passions, has dried up the souls of men, and hence how sparingly do they sow! how grudgingly do they seem to give towards the spread of the good word! Some preachers, who never were capable of exhibiting the truth to the understandings of men, too readily believe that miracles are necessary to convince; and the covetous man as greedily swallows the opium-like sentiment. The preacher, forgetting that he by this admission establishes the popular notion of the impotency of the word to convert sinners—nay, that he allows it to be a dead letter. To such a preacher I would say, 'Friend, go to thine own labor; for here thou art an unskilful workman;' and to the miser I would say, 'Read the eleventh chapter of Paul's letter to the Hebrews, and the first part of the fifth chapter of the epistle by James.'

Ever yours in the good hope,

J. HENSHAL.

Notes on a Tour to New York---No. 5.

FROM Baltimore we proceeded direct to New York, where we safely arrived on Saturday evening, the 30th November. On the arrival of the steam boat we were cordially received by brethren E. Parmly and Munroe, and conducted to the hospitable mansion of the former, where, in a short time, we were introduced to brethren Dr. Barker and Ovington. With these brethren we enjoyed all that Christian hospitality could bestow.

In this city there are three small societies, holding one Lord, one faith, and one immersion, which, for some years, have not sat down at the Lord's table, each having its own table. As vessels long retain the odor of the wines first infused into them, so those educated in sectarian schools long retain the opinions and traditions which they first imbibed. Hence these good brethren erected three tables suited to their respective views—one in Lawrence street, one in Canal street, one in Hudson street, holding at the same time one faith, one hope, one immersion, one body, one spirit, one Lord, and one Father, but *different opinions on some of the doctrines of men.*

I felt somewhat at a loss how to meet with them. To associate with any one of them exclusively, was to prejudge and condemn the others; to unite with any one of them which refused to commune with the other, was to sit down at a private sectarian table, and not at the Lord's table.

After some reflection and some inquiry into the views and feelings of these societies towards each other, I found that the society in Lawrence street would unite with the brethren in Hudson street, and

that the brethren in Hudson street would unite with the brethren in Lawrence street if the way was opened for them. I, therefore, resolved to unite with these as far as opportunity offered; and if the same spirit should be evinced by the Canal street, and if I should continue a third Lord's day in the city, resolved to spend it with them.

On the Lord's day, 31st of November, I accordingly met with the Lawrence street society over which Dr. Barker presides as overseer. My arrival not having been announced, we had the usual congregation. This society consisted of some seventy members, and the attendant auditors and spectators are in proportion to the number of the brethren. My address this morning was from 1 Cor. xi. on keeping the ordinances as delivered to us by the Apostles. It was shown that the gospel is exhibited first in words; second, in ordinances; third, in the lives of its professors. The whole gospel is first pronounced in words; then fully exhibited in Christian immersion, in the Lord's day, and in the Lord's supper. We *hear* it in words; we *see* it in ordinances; and we *exhibit* it in works. Our death to sin, our burial with Christ, our resurrection to a new life are shown in immersion; our reconciliation to God, through the sacrifices of the Messiah, is set forth in the supper, and our joint interest and fellowship in him as members of his body, appear in the participation of one loaf. The Lord's day not only commemorates the resurrection of Jesus, but anticipates the morning of the resurrection in which we shall enter into *the rest* which remains for the people of God.

Something was also said upon the conspicuity which this institution deserves in the weekly meetings of the family of God. The weekly meeting of the family of God, without any Lord's table or Lord's supper, is one of the poorest and most meagre things in creation. Miserably poor is that family, which, when assembled on some important occasion, has nothing to eat—not even a table in the house. Yet so poor is the family of God, if the numerous sects in our land give a fair representation of it. We cannot believe it. The disciples of Jesus always assembled on the Lord's day to commemorate the Lord's death and resurrection so long as the Christian religion continued pure and uncontaminated. It was shown that spiritual health, like physical health, requires not only wholesome food, but at proper and regular intervals. Therefore, a person may as reasonably say that he can enjoy good animal health on one meal in four days, as that he can be healthy in the Lord on one Lord's supper in four weeks. And if it be so, that "frequent communion," as it is called, diminishes its value or solemnity, then the seldomer the better. Once in a lifetime, on that principle, is enough. Where there is no law there is no transgression. Where there is no precedent there is no error; and if it be left to every man's own sense of propriety, there can be no fault in only commemorating the Lord's death once in a lifetime. But if it be said that it is left to our own sense of propriety, then unless it can be shown that a whole church has one and the same sense of propriety, there can be no communion; for if it should seem fit to ninety in the hundred to commune monthly or quarterly, and not to the ten, then there is a schism in the church, or no com-

munion at all. But the disciples assembled on the Lord's day to break the loaf in the times of the Apostles, as Luke teaches us in his writings, and as Paul argues in this letter to the Corinthians.

In the evening of that day we addressed a full house on the subject of the good confession and the bond of Christian union, as proposed by Jesus in his conversation with Peter in Cesarea, Philippi. Matth. xvi. Peter's confession of faith, and the keys of the kingdom of heaven as given to him, together with Paul's reasoning on the one foundation, (1 Cor. iii.) furnished the topic for the evening.

Through the instrumentality of my very kind friend Mr. Solyman Brown, the Jerusalem Temple was tendered to us for Tuesday evening, of which the public were only partially informed through some of the daily papers, as they were issued only a short time before the hour of meeting. The audience, therefore, was not sufficient to fill the house; but we found it necessary to commence our series of lectures. We, therefore, attempted to show *what the apostolic gospel is*, by ascertaining the time and place of its first promulgation, and all the grand accompaniments of its first development.

On Wednesday evening, the 3d of December, through the courtesy of Elder Chase, we addressed the public in the Union Chapel, Mott street. *Reconciliation and the word of reconciliation* was the theme.

On Thursday morning, being governmental thanksgiving day, we spoke in the same house on *regeneration*, from John iii.

As the city of New York is celebrated for its bold and philosophic scepticism, and as R. Dale Owen and Miss Frances Wright were said to have made great inroads there on the kingdom of the clergy—indeed, to have made many converts to infidelity—I was solicitous for an opportunity to appear before the Sceptics of the different Halls of Science of that city. Having ascertained that the two principal Halls were those of Tammany and Concert, at which they held weekly meetings for the dissemination of their principles, I solicited a hearing from the managers of these institutions. It was readily granted on the part of the Tammany Hall, which is the largest in the city; and also a similar opportunity was allowed me in the Concert Hall.

Accordingly the evening of thanksgiving day, at 7 o'clock, was announced as the time of my first speech in Tammany Hall. At the hour appointed we met a very large and highly respectable audience, who gave us a most attentive hearing for about one hour and a half. A number of Christians being present, we commenced by singing—

> "I'm not asham'd to own my Lord,
> Nor to defend his cause,
> Maintain the honor of his word,
> The glory of his cross."

After prayer, we gave for our theme a view of that religion which we pledged ourselves to defend in the words of Paul, (Titus ii. 12, 13, 14, 15.) contradistinguishing the genuine and uncorrupted religion of the gospel from all the sectarian abuses of it; also, the reasons why the Apostle Paul was not ashamed of the gospel in imperial Rome, the

then mistress of the world; took a view of the state of morals and philosophy in the Grecian and Roman cities before the gospel was announced; and expatiated on the literature, science, and political attainments of the age and countries in which Christianity was first introduced.

I then showed that the abuses of Christianity was no argument against its truth and excellency, any more than the abuse of any bounty or institution, human or divine, argues its falsity or inutility; drew an argument from the abuses of Christianity from the predictions of Paul concerning the man of sin, written thirty years after the crucifixion of the Messiah, showing the consummation of the apostacy to be one of the most unlikely events in the developments of time; and ascribed the scepticism of my audience to the profligacy, enthusiasm, and blind superstition of THE APOSTACY, rather than to the lack of evidence of the divine mission of Jesus of Nazareth.

Next descanted upon the felicity of the choice of a name which the sons of infidelity assumed as their designation. Their philosophy leading them neither to affirm nor deny the existence of God or the truth of revealed religion, but simply to doubt, they prudently called themselves *Sceptics*. We showed that, as philosophers, they could but doubt. No living man could say that he *knew* Christianity to be a fraud or to be false, because he was not in Jerusalem to see whether Jesus rose from the dead. He had no evidence from any of his senses that Christianity was false; therefore, never could say that he *knew* the gospel to be a lie. Again, no living man could say that he *believes* the gospel to be false, because without testimony there can be no faith; and there is not in the annals of the world one vestige of contemporaneous and contradictory testimony. No apostate, no Jew, Samaritan, or Gentile, who lived in those times, has given any testimony contrary to the Apostles. Now, inasmuch as no man who knows the meaning of words, can say he *knows* the gospel to be false, or *believes* it to be false; what can philosophers or philologists say of themselves, but that they doubt, or are simply sceptics?

Spoke of the honesty of Sceptics—admitted them to be honest men and good citizens in numerous instances; but in the enlarged sense of the word *honest*, comprehending our dues to God, to man, and to ourselves, doubted whether there was an *honest* Sceptic in the human race—because it would be admitted that the sanctions of eternal life or eternal death under which the gospel was believed or rejected, claimed the whole, undivided, and concentrated powers of man upon the evidence; and that we never yet found a sceptic who had examined fairly and fully both sides of the question; and, therefore, we must regard them as not honest to themselves.

Christianity, a religion of *facts*, and not of *opinions*, was to be tried in the proper court, as other questions of fact are to be tried—not arbitrary in choosing her judges, laws, or witnesses—she submits to the common judges, laws, and witnesses which are approved in those courts of inquiry in which questions of historic certainty are examined.

These preliminaries being submitted, we went into the examination of the doubts and difficulties of Sceptics:—

1st. The incomprehensibility of some of its principles is a frequent objection to its divine authenticity. We admitted this incomprehensibility; but demonstrated that if the incomprehensibility of some of its principles constituted a lawful objection against its truth, then every science in christendom must be rejected: for, from the Newtonian science of the universe down to the science of medicine, there is nothing called *science* which has not for its basis, or an essential part, certain recondite and abstract principles, which no man ever did, or ever will, comprehend.

Newton's centripetal and centrifugal powers are assumptions which are proved to be true and incomprehensible. The vital principle itself—the infinite divisibility of matter, electricity, magnetism, animalization, space, time, &c. &c. incomprehensible. A man cannot comprehend himself, much less any thing above himself, or any thing out of himself.. Nature and religion alike comprehensible and incomprehensible.

2. Christianity founded on miracles. No objection; for so is every system of scepticism. Every sceptic, upon his own definition of miracle, is constrained to adopt miracles. The difference between the Sceptic and Christian, in this one respect, is, that the former admits miracles without any testimony; the latter, on the best testimony in the world. We ask, Did nature exist before man? Then she must have suspended, changed, or new-modified her operations when she produced one. She ceased to operate in that way, for she never made a second. The first man was an adult—never an infant; but now nature gives infants. Matter has the same power now it ever had. It cannot now produce an oak without an acorn—a man without an infant. But this is not all: She made vegetables before she made man or animals. She either prepared them by degrees, as she now does; or she consummated them at once—for without them, man or animal could not have lived. All this is miracle. No Sceptic can commence any system without assuming a miracle. Christians *believe* them, and all nature, and philosophy, and ancient history prove them, &c.

3d. Christianity addresses itself to faith rather than to reason. Faith shown to be a better guide than reason. But as this was more fully developed in our second discourse to the Sceptics, we shall pause for the present. EDITOR.

How Indians read the Bible.

Mr. Editor—While on a visit to the state of A——, in the summer of 182–, an occurrence was related to me, which, if you think it worthy of publication, you may give it to your readers. It was substantially as follows:—

In the early part of the same year a *Paido-Baptist* preacher was employed by the Bible Society to distribute Bibles among the Indians of the Cherokee Nation. On presenting a Bible to a sprightly young man, who understood the English language, the preacher said to him, "Please accept this book, read it, believe it, and do what it commands you." It was received with a nod of acquiescence.

The next summer the Indian attended a camp-meeting in the neighborhood of the preacher, a short distance from the Tennessee river. He embraced the earliest opportunity of seeing the kind friend who had put into his hand a book which taught him the way of life and salvation. During the interview the Indian said to the preacher, "Mr. M——, I want you to go with me to the river." "Why," said the preacher, "do you wish me to go with you to the river?" "I want you to baptize me," replied the Indian. "I can baptize you without going to the river," said the preacher. "*Where?*" inquired the red man, anxiously. "HERE," responded the preacher. After looking hastily around him for a moment, the Indian inquired in a tone indicating surprize, "How can you baptize me here where there is no water?" He was told they could have water brought for the purpose. From the movements of the wild man it was evident he did not understand how he could be baptized there. Observing his perplexity and want of comprehension, the *teacher* found it necessary to explain the *mode* of baptism to this child of nature, who, being unacquainted with the modern changes and improvements in the fashionable world, had, by reading the Bible in the old-fashioned way, foolishly understood it to mean what it said. The ignorance of this uncultivated savage was removed by being informed that, by the ordinance as it *now* stood, they avoided both the disgrace and trouble of going to the river, and it was to be performed by *pouring a little water on his forehead!*

The man of the woods had his eye steadily fixed on his spiritual instructer until the explanation was concluded, when his countenance fell; and gazing vacantly into space, he stood some time lost in thought; then starting up as from a reverie, and fastening his eye again upon the preacher, he, in a tone of voice and with a countenance expressive of disappointment and surprize, inquired anxiously, "*Is that baptism?*" He was answered in the affirmative. A momentary pause ensued; then, as if calling to recollection something which had not occurred before to explain the mystery, he exclaimed—"WELL, IF THAT IS BAPTISM, YOU GAVE ME THE WRONG BOOK!!"

His idea seemed to be that each sect, (or *company*, as another Cherokee* once called the different denominations,) had a book or Bible of their own; and this gentleman had, through mistake, given him a *Baptist* Bible; for that represented baptism to be immersion.

So reasoned an unsophisticated child of nature, who read the scriptures as they stand, without the aid of any expositor, and without

*When asked why he did not become a Christian, he replied, "I am waiting to see which *company is right.*"

having any system in his eye or any preconceived opinion to support, but to learn what the book required that he might do it.

Query.—If all read the Bible as the Indian did, would they not come to the same conclusion—viz. that if any believe baptism to mean any thing but immersion, they must learn it from some other book?

The above was related to me by several persons who were present and heard the conversation between the preacher and the Indian. Two of them were at that time members of the Paido-Baptist communion; and, if I am not mistaken, were led, from the remarks of the Indian, to read the Bible in the same old-fashioned way, and came to the same conclusion, and were afterwards immersed. One of them is now a preacher in the reformation, of more than ordinary talents.

MATTER OF FACT.

Washington, D. C. December 30, 1833.

The Old Man of the Church.

SINBAD the Sailor, in his multifarious and adventurous wandering, once chanced to land in a desert island, in which a strange creature, the Old Man of the Sea, leapt upon his shoulders; and there, spite of all his efforts to dislodge him, night and day, for a long time, maintained his station. By day he compelled poor Sinbad, by a vigorous application of his heels to his ribs, to go where he pleased,—beneath the trees, whence he plucked fruit, or to the stream, where he drank. By night he still clung, even in his sleep, with such sensitiveness to his neck, that it was impossible to unseat him. At length a successful stratagem presented itself to Sinbad. He found a gourd, and squeezed into it the juice of the grape, and set it in a certain place till it had fermented, and became strong wine. This he put to the mouth of the Old Man of the Sea, who drank it greedily, became drunk, and fell asleep so soundly that Sinbad unfolded his clinging legs from his breast, hurled him from his shoulders, and, as he lay, crushed his head with a stone. The adventure of Sinbad was awkward enough; but that of poor human nature has been infinitely worse. *The Old Man of the Church*, from age to age, from land to land, has ridden on the shoulders of humanity, and set at defiance all endeavors and all schemes to dislodge him. Unlike the Old Man of the Sea, whose best beverage was a brook, he is too well inured to strong drinks to be readily overcome by them. He is one of those drinkers called deep-stomached, and strong-headed; who sit out all guests, dare and bear all spiritous potations, and laugh, in invulnerable comfort, over the intoxication of the prostrated multitude. And what wonder? His seat has ever been at the boards of princes. The most sparkling cup has not passed him by untasted; the most fiery fluid has not daunted him. He has received the vintages reserved solely for kings and their favorites; and though there was blood in it, he has not blenched. The tears of misery dropped into it could not render it too bitter; the bloody sweat-drops of despair too poisonous; though the sound of battle was in his ears, he ceased not to grasp the flagon,—it was music,—though martyrs burned at their stakes before him, and the very glow of their fires came strongly upon him, he interrupted not his carouse, but only cooled more gratefully his wine. He has quaffed the juice of all vines; presided at the festivities of all nations; poured libations to all gods; in the wild orgies of the ancient German and British forests he has revelled; in the midnight feast of skulls he has pledged the savage and the cannibal; the war-feast of the wilderness, or the sacred banquet of the refined Greek, alike found him a guest; he has taken the cup of pollution from the hand of the

Babylonian harlot; and pledged, in the robes of the Gallic Primate, renunciation of the Christian religion with the Atheist. Lover of all royal fetes; delighter in the crimson-cushioned ease of all festivals in high places; soul of all jollity where the plunderers and the deluders of man met to rejoice over their achievements; inspirer of all choice schemes for the destruction of liberty and genuine knowledge when the vintage of triumphant fraud ferments in his brain, till the wine of God's wrath, in the shape of man's indignation, confound him, —what shall move him from his living throne? From the days of the Flood to those of William IV. of England, he has ridden on, exultingly, the everlasting incubus of the groaning world!

[*Howitt's History of Priestcraft.*]

Superstitious Credulity.

A WIDOW lady at Paris, aged 63, who lodged on a two pair of stairs floor, in the Rue de la Ferroniere, with only a maid servant, was accustomed to spend several hours every day before the altar dedicated to Saint Paul, in a neighboring church. Some villains observing her extreme bigotry, resolved, as she was known to be very rich, to share her wealth. One of them accordingly took the opportunity to conceal himself behind the carved work of the altar, and when no person but the old lady was there, in the dusk of the evening, he contrived to throw a letter just before her. She took it up, and not perceiving any one near, supposed it came by a miracle. In this she was the more confirmed when she saw it signed 'Paul the Apostle,' expressing the satisfaction he received by her prayers addressed to him, when so many newly canonized saints engrossed the attention of the world, and robbed the primitive saints of their adoration; and to show his regard for the devotee, he promised to come from heaven, with the angel Gabriel, and sup with her at 8 in the evening. It seems scarcely credible that any one could be deceived by so gross a fraud; yet to what length of credulity will not superstition carry a weak mind! The infatuated lady believed the whole, and rose from her knees in transport to prepare an entertainment for her heavenly guests.

The supper being bespoken and the sideboard set out to the best advantage, she thought that her own plate, worth about 400*l.* did not make so elegant an appearance as might be wished; and therefore sent to her brother, a counsellor in Parliament at Paris, to borrow all his plate. The maid, however, was charged not to disclose the occasion; but only to say that she had company to supper, and would be obliged to him if he would lend his plate that evening. The counsellor, surprised at the application, well knowing his sister's frugal life, began to suspect that she was enamored of some fortune-hunter, who might marry her, and thus deprive his family of what he expected at his sister's death. He therefore positively refused to send the plate, unless the maid would tell him what guests were expected. The girl, alarmed for her mistress' honor, declared that her pious lady had no thought of a husband; but St. Paul having sent her a letter from heaven, promising he and the angel Gabriel would sup with her to supper, she wanted to make the entertainment as elegant as possible.

The counsellor immediately suspected that some villains had imposed on her, and sending the maid with the plate, had proceeded directly to the commissary of that quarter. On the magistrate's going with him to a house adjoining, they saw, just before 8 o'clock, a tall man, dressed in long vestments, with a white beard, and a young man in white, with large wings at his shoulders, alight from a hackney coach and go up to his sister's apartment.

The commissary immediately ordered twelve of the police guards to post themselves on the stairs, while he knocked at the door and desired admittance. The lady replied that she had company and could not speak to any one. But the commissary answered that he must come in, for that he was St. Peter, and

had come to ask St. Paul and the angel Gabriel how they came out of heaven without his knowledge. The divine visiters were astonished at this, not expecting any more saints to join them; but the lady, overjoyed at having so great an Apostle with her, ran eagerly to the door; when the commissary, her brother, and police guards rushed in, presented their muskets, seized her guests and conducted them to prison. On searching the criminals, two cords, a razor, and a pistol were found in St. Paul's pocket, and a gag in that of the angel Gabriel. Three days after the trial came on; when they pleaded in their defence, that one was a soldier in the French infantry, and the other a barber's apprentice—that they had no other design than to procure a good supper at the widow's expense—that it being carnival time, they had borrowed these dresses, and the soldier having picked up the two cords, put them into his pocket—that the razor was that with which he had constantly shaved himself—that the pistol was to defend them from any insult to which their strange habits might expose them in going home—and that the apprentice, whose master was a tooth-drawer, merely had the gag which they sometimes use in their business. These excuses, frivolous as they were, proved of some avail; and as they had not committed by an overt act they were both acquitted.

But the counsellor, who foresaw what might happen through the defect of evidence, had provided another stroke for them. No sooner, therefore, were they discharged from the civil powers, than the apparitor of the archbishop of Paris immediately seized them and conveyed them to the ecclesiastical prison. In three days more they were tried and convicted of a most scandalous profanation by assuming to themselves the names, characters, and appearance of a holy apostle and a blessed angel, with an intent to deceive a pious and well meaning woman, to the scandal of religion. They were accordingly condemned to be publicly whipped, and burnt on the shoulder with a red hot iron, and sent to the gallies for fifteen years—a sentence which was in a few days faithfully put in execution.

Progress of Reform.

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

Greenville, N. C. November 17, 1833.

THERE are four or five of us in this section of country who are engaged in publishing the ancient gospel. I am told that the Neuse Association did, at its last session, exclude us and prohibit us the use of their pulpits, alleging that we were C——ites. I am on the eve of starting to Alabama and Mississippi, and wish you had the means of knowing my character and standing, so that you could recommend me to the brethren. The cause here is gaining ground, notwithstanding there is great persecution and proscription; but we are moved by none of those things. Allow me to mention as my fellow-laborers, Jeremiah Ligget, Abraham Congleton, and John P. Dunn, brethren of the most pure and unblemished religious characters. After having stated the gospel facts, and laid open the plan of salvation as clearly as I could, I have heard them express their surprize at its simplicity, and to say that it was as plain as their hand, and that it must stand whilst the Bible stands.

WILLIAM CLARK.

Maury County, Ten. November 23, 1833.

NOTHING of importance has transpired in this section, since my last communication to you, worthy of your attention, except the gradual increase of the principles of the reformation. You are already acquainted with our situation in relation to the surrounding sectarians. I need not reiterate the old story of their opposition. If any converts are made with us, it must be principally from their ranks, as they are all, or nearly so, born in the church

here. As Herod and Pilate were made friends in opposing the Messiah, so there appears a pretty general union, in this part of the county, with the different professions, against the religion of the New Testament.—— The brethren, generally, retain their integrity, and contend, in the spirit of meekness, for "*the faith* once delivered to the saints." Our increase in the church on Cathey's Creek has been a little upwards of twenty during the present year. We now number about seventy.

JAMES N. BROWN.

CANNON'S CREEK, Maury county, Ten. December 4, 1833.

I ATTENDED a four days meeting (including the 4th Lord's day in October last) at Poplar Creek, Limestone county, Alabama; where I had the pleasure of declaring "the glad tidings concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ," for two hours on each day, to an attentive audience. Eight persons confessed that Jesus Christ is Lord by submitting to the institution of immersion for the remission of sins. We had, truly, a time of refreshing from the presence of the Lord. The reformation has made a *very fair beginning* in Limestone county, having amongst its advocates several of the more intelligent part of the community, a number of whom have shared largely in the *honors of this world*, but are now willing to seek "*the honor which comes from God only.*"

JOSHUA K. SPEER.

PLEASANT VALLEY, Ten. December 13, 1833.

I SEAT myself to address a note to you on the subject of the Christian religion, the all-engrossing subject with me. I came to this county last January, where for some time I did not meet with any of our brethren. I at length went to Paris, and there found three of the most amiable disciples that heart could wish. So one old father and two youngsisters, myself and wife, occasionally met together, talked of the goodness of God, read his word, sung and prayed, and thus spent our time, not being able to hear one of our proclaiming brethren for something like ten months; when, to our great joy and surprize, brother J. M'Call visited our little town (Paris) on the 5th of November, and commenced proclaiming the glorious gospel of the Son of God. On the 10th he immersed one lady, and continued teaching until the 17th. We then, being 19 in number, organized and constituted ourselves a congregation of the Lord, acknowledging the word of God as our only law, breaking bread, &c. This was, indeed, a time of rejoicing.

Brother M'Call did not intend when he stopped to tarry but a few days; but from the pressing solicitude of the citizens, and the warmth of sectarian opposers, he consented to stay till the 26th. He, therefore, continued to teach and baptize for the remission of sins; the result of which was, that some half dozen of our Methodist friends were immersed, and some Presbyterians. On the 24th, at night, three young men, one of the first standing in society, made the good confession, and the same hour of the night were immersed. The scene was truly interesting; the ground was covered with snow; and there was, I think, 150 persons at the water. Early in the morning a lady in town sent for brother M'Call to immerse her. A number of the citizens repaired to the place of immersion, saying as they went, 'it was so cold it would put her faith to the test.' She was immersed, and returned home through the snow. Before brother M'Call changed his clothes, a young man, a Cumberland Presbyterian, went to him and demanded baptism, He returned and immersed him. At the edge of the water one of his young friends met him, went into the water, and was immersed; also, another. Brother M'Call immersed 25 during his stay. We now number 31. We should be extremely glad if some of our brethren, better qualified to teach than ourselves, would visit us. O how powerful is the sword of the Spirit when wielded in its plain and simple style! Stript of all human dogmas, it will as surely convert sectarians and sinners as Jesus reigns in heaven!

W. Z. GOODMAN.

CADIZ, Harrison county, Ohio, Dec. 14, 1833.

SINCE I last saw you my health has gradually improved up to the present time. I continue to visit the congregations in Knoxville, Olivet, (on Cross Creek, Smithfield, and Deersville, regularly—together with sundry other places. The brethren in this section of country are generally "strong in the Lord and in the power of his might." Additions are made occasionally to the above named congregations. I recently delivered five discourses in Nottingham, Harrison county, when twenty-three souls made the good confession, and were "baptized for the remission of their sins." The prospect in that place is truly flattering. The call for evangelists is great and urgent. I should be pleased to receive a fellow-laborer, "clothed with the panoply of Heaven." Will not some church favor me and the inquiring multitude with one?

ROBERT COOK.

EVEREETT'S HOUSE, Ky. Dec. 20, 1833.

SINCE the first of of last March Elder David Hathaway has immersed 71 persons for the remission of sins. The cause of reform is still progressing. We seldom meet but additions are made to the household of faith. Persecution and sectarianism rage; but truth is mighty and will prevail.

THEO. N. HASSON.

MOUNT VERNON, Illinois, December 25, 1833.

I HAVE delayed writing you for several months, in order the better to be prepared to give you an account of the progress of the good work of reform in this part of the state; and I am not now fully prepared, but it would seem useless to wait any longer; I must, therefore, barely hint a few things.

In this county, and the one immediately on the North, (Merion,) there are four proclaimers of the ancient gospel, viz. Joseph Chaffin, D. R. Chance, Samuel Shook, and your unworthy servant. The three brethren above named, some ten or twelve months since, left the Baptist Church of Christ, actuated in so doing by the love of truth. I myself left the United Baptists some two or three years since, and you know when such a circumstance takes place they uniformly publish such a one excluded. This is my case, as you, perhaps, may have seen in the Minutes of the Bethel Association; but I defy that Association or the church which I left, to show from their records a single charge of immorality against me. At the time I left the church there were some seven or eight members went with me. We formed ourselves into a church; and, notwithstanding the opposition we have had to meet, the Lord has preserved us; and at almost every meeting there are additions made to our number. At our protracted meeting in last month, which lasted five days and nights, there were eleven added by immersion—five of that number were Methodists. This county may be called the strong hold of Methodism. They have some six or eight preachers, beside exhorters and class-leaders in abundance; but their numbers are sufficient to withstand the pure testimony.

The brethren above spoken of all reside in Merion county. They have four churches, all in a prosperous condition, and new additions made at almost every meeting. Brother Chaffin not long since immersed five of the Methodist members. From these circumstances you will readily guess at the opposition from that sect. But none of these things move us. May the good work progress until the world shall be revolutionized, and the followers of Christ be one as he is one with the father!

JOHN BAUGH.

SPOTTSYLVANIA, Va. December 31, 1833.

IT is night, and the last night of 1833. What changes in a hundred years! My meaning is not in relation to arts and sciences, manners and customs, &c. but in relation to the beings that people this world. *Where now are those of* 1733? and *where, a century hence, will be these of* 1833? *Soon* will our race be run. O may we rejoice in the day of the Messiah, that we did not run in vain!

Brother Webber and myself attended our appointments for meeting at brother Wrenn's in Powhatan county, on the 30th ult. and 1st inst. On the morn-

ing of the latter I immersed two young persons, a brother and sister. In the afternoon brother Webber returned home, having publicly promised to visit that people once-a-month. On the 2d of this month I immersed another couple, a brother and sister; and on the 7th a widow lady. On the 8th formed a congregation of nine disciples, brother Wrenn being of the number. I left them with a cheering prospect of additions.

ALBERT ANDERSON.

'Wherein do you excel?'

THIS is such a common sense sort of question, that every one expects to hear it who professes any thing different from others. If a person proposes to himself any object superior to those objects which the many propose to themselves, he cannot think of accomplishing it unless by doing more than others. Does a student desire to excel his companions in science? He must read more, think more, labor more than they. Does any one propose to himself more learning, more wealth, more fame, more honor than fall to the lot of the many? and will he not feel and think that he must make greater exertions than others, and use means correspondent to the end proposed? This is common sense.

In religion is it otherwise? Does a person profess religion? Then all the world expect a difference, not only from himself in days that are past, but from all who do not profess religion. But in no department in society is this expectation more correctly founded, more general, than in reference to those who profess to be reformers in religion. Envy and jealousy, and the zeal of those who feel themselves rivalled in such attempts, will lead them to exclaim, 'In what do these reformers excel? Excellence, they say, they profess; but in what, and how far?'

But we professors of reformation were not induced to this course because others will goad us with the question *Wherein do you excel?* but because we saw that personal, family, and social reformation were indispensable, and have set out in this great and holy enterprize.

Brethren, we must excel—we must do more than others. A Christian is one of rare excellence. He is one that greatly excels all other men. His model casts a shade over all the excellence of the heathen world. As the stars become invisible when the sun lifts his glowing face above the horizon, so all the excellence of the Pagan world is unworthy of admiration in the presence of the Sun of Righteousness More, then, much more will be expected from us Christians, than from those who never had before them a model of perfect excellence.

But in reference to our fellows in this age of apostacy, there are various points in which we must excel, else we shall fall short of our standard of religion and morality. Our standard is the Bible. Theirs is the Bible as explained and set forth at Rome, at Westminster, at Geneva, or at Cambridge—that is, the Bible lowered down in its tone of religion and morality to suit courts and worldly sanctuaries.—Every body who can think correctly, must know that a perfect sectary

is a very imperfect Christian. We want much more than the liturgy, or the books of discipline framed by the sons of hierarchies, to bring us up to the Christian Standard—the Bible alone.

Brethren of the reformation, we want more knowledge of the Scriptures, more faith, more zeal, more liberality, a higher and a purer morality, more disconformity to this vain and foolish world—we want the devotedness to God which distinguished the first Christians. To these points we intend to call your attention in the present volume. We shall be explicit—we shall speak out. The Lord's cause demands it. It is not a reformation in theory, in name, in profession; but in *reality*, for which we contend. We shall lose our labor if we fail in the end proposed.

In the first place, then, (and we can only now suggest it) every reformer must read, and study, and even commit the scriptures to memory, more than other professors—more than he has done formerly—He must have the word of Christ dwelling in his heart—he must be able to bring out of his treasury things new and old.

There is nothing more distressing to an intelligent and benevolent mind, than the prevailing ignorance of the Living Oracles. Fathers, mothers, and children are, in innumerable instances, almost alike ignorant of the Word of Life. In travelling a hundred miles one cannot find, sometimes, a single family that altogether can repeat a single epistle or two chapters of Old Testament or New. We repeat it, this must not be so amongst the disciples. We must either renounce our profession, or reform. Every Christian family ought to be a nursery for Christ. Moses and all the Prophets, as well as all the Apostles, concur in admonishing us in this affair.

We may, in our next number, submit to our readers a plan of improvement in this business. The reformation we plead calls for more knowledge of God's word and will—of his precepts and his promises; for more prayer—more abstraction from the world—more devotion to God—more purity, and more consecration of ourselves to the Lord, than appear in any sect in Christendom. On these we must be—we shall be, most explicit.

EDITOR.

ERRATA.

Vol. 4, p. 542, line 18th from bottom, instead of "Schools," read *Mr. Schools.*

Vol. 4, p. 563, 22d line from top, for "Curtis Curtis," read Curtis *Carter.*

Vol. 5, page 17, line 2d from top, for "designings," read *designs.*

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Number II.——Volume V.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Bethany, Va. February, 1834.

Signs of the Times.

[CONTINUED.]

THE New Testament abounds with prophecy relative to the second coming of Christ; and those predictions, numerous and pointed, are as badly misapplied as those respecting his first. The Jews expected a temporal Prince—our teachers are applying prophecy relative to his second coming, to the end of time. The mistakes of the present are to be as fatal as those of the former.

Of the many passages where the coming of Christ is mentioned, but a few of the most pointed will be quoted, as they all concentrate to the same point. The reader will find some repetitions—they are sometimes necessary; and a very necessary admonition of the Master says "Watch, therefore, for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come." "Therefore, be ye also ready; for in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of Man cometh." "Blessed is that servant, whom his Lord, when he cometh, shall find so doing." This coming cannot have an allusion to the then present time; Christ could not, with propriety, speak of a coming that had already taken place.

It well becomes us with the utmost solicitude, the most careful and impartial examination, to ascertain if such an event is to take place as the descent of the "King of Kings." The astonishing indifference on this important subject will prove the undoing of thousands who are expecting a seat in the kingdom of God. Is God never to give the world another proof or token that he superintends its destinies or the government of his creatures? Without some such display of omnipotent power and glory, can it be possible that the present barriers and moral restraints on the human family will keep them in check a thousand years longer, or till the end of time? Can it be that the present system of moral light and government under the manage-

ment of human hands, (already ruined by them,) is to put forth new vigor, and by gradual progression arrive at millennial perfection? Eighteen hundred years of human management has brought God's heritage on earth to what it is at—scarcely a vestige of pure unadulterated Christianity to be found. Now can the same administration, managed by hands growing more mercenary and less pious, mend it in a thousand more? Impossible!*

To reason and common sense, a millennium, such as the Bible warrants us to expect, is a downright impossibility under the present system and order of things. Reason says a change is indispensably necessary—a flood of light, or a flood of vengeance. A flood of light and a flood of vengeance are both foretold; such as the second coming of the Master—the casting down of thrones and dominions—and the infliction of all the plagues and vials of wrath written within the lids of God's Holy Book.

In Luke xxii. there is a prediction which no one can prove to have had an accomplishment. If in the future, it must correspond with our own views and strengthen them. "Ye are they which have continued with me in my temptations; and I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Compare this with Rev. v. 11. "And hast made us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall reign upon the earth." The Apostles, without doubt, compose a part of the "four and twenty elders." Perhaps the patriarchs make out the twenty-four. They are to reign on the earth. And, from the very face of the narrative, they must be glorified beings. Perhaps our dubbed Doctors can tell us who they are; and that they are now reigning in the churches by their laws, precepts, government, &c. Now if they are reigning through the medium of their laws, precepts, &c. then it was their laws, precepts, &c. which fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, &c.! The very beings which fell down before the Lamb are to "*reign on the earth.*" They can be nothing but intelligent beings—who have been conspicuous characters on earth. Compare with this Rev. xx. "And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them." Also, 1 Cor. 6. "Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world?" See Danl. vii. "And judgment was given to the saints of the Most High, and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom."

I have already shown that the present race of saints may not reign. Could they reign jointly? Can they worship together? Can they commune together? One plain negative answers all these questions. Or, which of the saints may hold the sceptre? No one occurrence would sooner produce war the most untameable than the coronation of any one of the sects. The constitution of the present

*It is said that above eighty millions of dollars are yearly expended on priests and sceptred divinity—more than was expended on all Christendom in the first five hundred years of its existence. Eighty millions more would probably make Christianity, so called, eighty times worse than it is.

moral government must be changed before the saints may reign; and who but the Master can do this? And in plain truth, they must be a different race of saints from those produced by any common popular process of saint-making now-a-days.

Relative to the Apostles sitting on the twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes: There can be no tribes in a state of immortality; and it has not been fulfilled on earth. Eating at the Master's table, and drinking of the fruit of the vine new in the kingdom of the Father, has a corresponding meaning. Christ ate after his resurrection; and is it unreasonable to suppose a state of existence, in immortality, is sustained by means No created being in all the universe of God "hath life in himself." The King saith, "For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself. These opinions are advanced as considerations coupled with the coming of Christ and his kingdom.

Luke gives a very interesting narrative respecting the ascension of Christ into heaven. After giving the Apostles all necessary instruction relative to the government of his church, with precepts, promises, &c. he led them out as far as the Mount of Olives. "While he blessed them he was parted from them. While they beheld he was taken up, and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." Compare with this Peter's prediction: "Whom the heavens must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets." Our teachers are telling us that Christ is to come at the dissolution of all things. But Peter gives fair grounds to expect him at a certain restitution spoken of by the holy Prophets?

It is a matter of much wonder, indeed, if a restitution and a dissolution be one and the same thing. Peter refers to what the Prophets had said about this restitution. Such a dissolution as is palmed on us from the pulpit, is not to be found among God's holy Prophets.

We will hear the testimony of the holy Prophets on the subject:— "But in the last days it shall come to pass, that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills, and the people shall flow unto it." "And many nations shall come, and say, Come, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." "And he shall judge among many people, and rebuke strong nations afar off; and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks; and nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. But they shall sit every man under his own vine and under his fig tree, and none shal make them afraid: for the mouth of the Lord of hosts hath spoken

it." "Instead of the thorn shall come up the fir tree, and instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle tree; and it shall be to the Lord for a name, for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off." "The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf, and the young lion, and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. The cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together: and the lion shall eat straw like the ox," &c. "They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." "And they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest." "The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them, and the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose," &c. "And the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads: they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away."

This is the restitution spoken of by the mouth of his holy Prophets —a restitution which will take into its mighty range the once favored sons of Jacob—when the Lord shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people. And until the time of this restitution, according to Peter's account, "the heavens must receive the Son of Man;" and at this time he is to change his residence on the fairest principles of construction. Peter's expression is well calculated to strengthen the opinion that Christ was to return a second time. The disciples were all possessed with such a belief. There is inconsistency in Peter's remarks if he could not have answered such a question as this, 'Where will Christ be at the time of this restitution?' Peter, a little before this memorable sermon, had witnessed the ascension of his Lord, and had heard a prediction at the time and place, by unequivocal authority, relative to his return. The circumstance and prophecy about his return were alive in his recollection; and this restitution, according to Peter, is in perfect accordance with the burden of prophecy—the sayings of all the holy Prophets.

Paul bears testimony to the same import, Phil. iii. 20. "For our conversation is in heaven, from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ," [see 1 Thess. iii. 13,] "to the end he may establish our hearts unblameable in holiness before God, even our Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints." In this place Paul must have the same object in view with the holy Prophet Zechariah. [See chap. xiv. 4.] "And his feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives," "And the Lord thy God shall come, and all the saints with thee," &c. "And it shall be in that day that living waters shall go out from Jerusalem," &c. "And the Lord shall be King over all the earth. In that day shall there be one Lord, and his name one." Alike passages must have a like meaning. Can there be two comings with all the saints?

The greatest adept in spiritualizing and rendering God's word unintelligible, cannot transfer these predictions in Zechariah over to the

close of time. It would require extraordinary talents, in truth, to spiritualize the following verse, which must be taken into connexion with the foregoing:—"All the land shall be turned as a plain, from Geba to Rimmon, south of Jerusalem; and it shall be lifted up and inhabited in her place," &c. "and men shall dwell in it, and there shall be no more utter destruction; but Jerusalem shall be safely inhabited." All this is to take place after a descent of the Lord upon the Mount of Olives with all the saints.

The second epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians contains one of the most pointed prophecies on the subject before us: "And to you who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ."

There is an item in the above quotation which should alarm every unbeliever in christendom. Christ is just so sure to "take vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel," at his coming, as there is truth in Paul the Apostle. Alas! how few will be found obeying! The want of obedience is that which is demanding his presence. How important is it to be found scrupulously obeying every command of the Master, when he is to be "revealed from heaven with his mighty angels in flaming fire"! Is this a different fire from the fiery stream which "issued and came forth from before him"?

The first and second chapters of 2d Thessalonians should be read in close connexion—should not have been broken by chapters. No part of Holy Writ contains matters of greater importance. The items as they stand in point of fact, are—1st. A falling away. 2d. The rise of the son of perdition. 3d. Christ revealed in flaming fire. 4th. Our gathering together unto him. Long ago did this falling away take place, and this son of perdition rise, "who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." The worship and reverence paid to his Holiness of Rome —the authority he and his servants (the Priests) take over and above the Sacred Oracles—the authority he assumes, or has been granted him by the church, over the destinies of man, in heaven, earth, and hell, is a sufficient comment on the above quotation. Any government in the church, exalted above the government of God's word, is antichristian in its degree, and is a usurpation in the temple of God. When God's word is proven insufficient to govern his house, his temple, it is then time enough for human wisdom to legislate for its God.

Paul foretold very exactly the falling away which was to precede the rise of the man of sin, and the character of this son of perdition about five hundred years before the church gave him birth. We, therefore, may safely rely on the fulfilment of his prophecy respecting the downfall of this same Antichrist, and the mighty events which are to precede his fall—"Whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his com-

ing." Can any thing be plainer than that the fall of Antichrist is to be in consequence of the Lord's coming? Arguments are useless when such authority as Paul is so pointed to the case. I can see no ground for a cavil. If we place the coming of the Lord at the end of time, we must fix the fall of Antichrist there also. Nor can this be a different coming from that so often foretold—'in the clouds of heaven.'

Another item in the prophecy is, the gathering together of his people. His flock is scattered in this "cloudy and dark day." "Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him," &c. "that there may be one Shepherd and one sheepfold." At the present there are many folds and many shepherds, crying, "Lo! here is Christ!"

As before observed, the coming of Christ and the fall of the son of perdition, are to be contemporaneous events, let them take place when they may. And there is no doubt in my mind but the commonly received opinions about the judgment are as erroneous as popular opinions in every thing else are—in religious matters especially.

Our teachers admit that Antichrist is to fall they know not how; but it will take place in God's own time and way. But it must not take place by the coming of the Son of Man. O, no; this looks too much like the dreadful doomsday they so often in their surcharged sermons paint off in such terrific array, of melted rocks and burning worlds. O, no; if the King comes personally at the introduction of his universal reign, their thrones and dominions, their names and distinctions, their creeds and bonds of union, by which they have scattered the flock of Christ in "the cloudy and dark day," will go with the general wreck. The doctrine of resurrecting in a moment the whole human family, burning up the world, congregating the immense posterity of Adam upon some vast theatre—there consigning them by myriads to their eternal destination, without an interrogative being proposed or answered, would well suit many who expect to sleep off a thousand imperfections in the grave, and be admitted with the glorified host into Paradise, for having said, "Lord! Lord!" instead of doing the will of the Father which is in heaven.

At the coming of Christ, no doubt but those who have heard and obeyed the gospel, will receive their reward—will enter into immortality. And those who have heard and disobeyed, will be judged according to their works; for he is to "judge the living and the dead at his appearing in his kingdom." Daniel corroborates the same idea: "And many of them that slept in the dust of the earth shall awake; some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." "Many" must be a part—not the whole. Therefore, the final judgment cannot be alluded to.

[*To be continued.*]

Copy-Right for the People.

SO cowardly and unjust are some of the conductors of the religious press, that we are obliged to have recourse to the following expedient

to secure to the public the right of hearing both sides, or of hearing neither. It will be recollected that we have complained that many of the sectarian prints have invariably published the productions of our opponents, even when they were extracted from our pages, without permitting their readers to hear our defence, and thus constraining them to decide from *exparte* evidence. Even Mr. Waterman's letters and essays, extracted from our pages, were published in the "Zion's Herald & Christian Journal," (a paper which boasts of some 24,000 subscribers,) and not one word of our answers or replies was permitted to appear in its columns. The Editors refused, even on our remonstrance, to republish so much of one of our essays as was necessary to remove a very grievous reproach which they had attempted to fasten upon us. So that we stand charged of Unitarianism before all their readers, and these cannot be less than one hundred thousand, if there are only four readers for every paper. In this wholesale way of reproach and slander, are we treated by those who accuse us of the want of a Christian Spirit. To complain of such enormous iniquity and injustice is positive proof that we are destitute of Christian charity; and to falsify in the ratio of one hundred thousand at a time, is demonstrative evidence that these Editors and Ministers are moved by the Holy Spirit! A person who, from the pulpit to a single congregation, or by the fireside to his neighbors, reproaches and wilfully misrepresents an individual, is a saint in comparison of him who publishes it to the whole Union, and gives to it the permanency and potency of the press. Till the day of judgment arrives, as far as these gentlemen have the ears of the community in their keeping, am to be regarded and viewed in the light of one who denies the divine nature of the Redeemer.

We have appealed to their honor, their conscience, their magnanimity; but in vain. We are now compelled to defend ourselves and the public; and nothing remains but the law, which the Apostle says *was made not for the righteous, but for the unrighteous, the lawless, and the profane.* We have taken out a copy-right for all the pieces of defamation, for all the productions of our opponents against our views, which are sent to us for publication. We give both sides—and we will compel our opponents, if they republish any of these which first appear in our pages, to republish our replies. This is all we ask—it is all we wish. In every case we grant them LICENSE (notwithstanding our copy-right) to republish the letters and essays of our opponents which appear in our pages; provided always, they republish our answers. But if any one of them republishes the productions of our opponents without our replies, we have paid for the copy-right for the express purpose of teaching them righteousness by an argument which the Apostle says is well adapted to them alone.

The copy-right covers their writings—not ours; and from this time forth it is covenanted that every opponent either publish his pieces somewhere else, or, if he send them to us, that he constitutute us *the proprietor* of them for the sake of their appearance in this work. As such we will receive and publish them; and upon this condition only—

should they be worthy of publication. If any one wish to have a specimen of those pieces which we consider too mean and contemptible for a civilized population, he may find it in the "*Western Luminary*," published by the Presbyterians in Lexington, Ky. Any one who wishes to falsify and slander without being noticed, is recommended to that periodical. Like the sewer of a great city, it carries the filth down to Avernus.

Should any of our present opponents, who contribute to our pages, hereafter withhold their communications, it will be understood that they wrote for the sake of effect abroad, and not for our edification or that of our readers. These things premised, we insert for their edification the Copy-Right, and the running title under which their productions are, from time to time, to appear. They shall be numerically arranged under the title found in the Copy-Right; and their appearance under it shall be a *sign* between me and all my opponents that they are *my property* according to the laws of the United States. I again repeat, that they shall not be prosecuted if they re-publish both sides; but if they republish the opposition without the defence, they must be brought to *legal*, if not to evangelical repentance.

A. CAMPBELL.

[COPY-RIGHT.]

Western District of Virginia, to wit:

Be it remembered, That on the 3d day of February, A. D. 1834, Alexander Campbell, of the said district, has deposited in this office the title of a book, the title of which is in the words following, *to wit:*

Letters and Addresses to A. Campbell, in Opposition to his Writings, Public Speeches, and Proceedings, as an Advocate of Reformation in Religious Society; also, Essays upon his Views and upon the Doctrine of the Reformation for which he pleads—by J. A. Waterman, *a Minister of the Methodist Society; and other writers who, from time to time, contribute for the Millennial Harbinger, in Opposition to his Sentiments.*

The right whereof he claims as proprietor, in conformity to an act of Congress, titled "an act to amend the several acts respecting copy-rights."

J. Y. DODDRIDGE

Letters, &c. to A. Campbell---No. 1.

MR. A. CAMPBELL,

Dear Sir,

IN my last I said, that, in reading a passage in your Extra on *Regeneration*, I was much afflicted, and would beg the favor of addressing you my thoughts at some future time. The passage alluded to is found in the 376th page, and reads as follows:—"The time has again come when judgment must begin at the house of God. The people who have long enjoyed the word of life and the Christian institutions, must soon come to a reckoning—they must give an account of

their stewardship; for the Lord has promised to call them to judgment. An era is just at the door, which will be known as *the Regeneration* for a thousand years to come. The Lord will judge that *adulterous brood*, and give them over to the burning flame, who have broken the covenant and formed alliances with the governments of the earth. Now the cry is heard in *our land*, "Come out of her my people, that you partake not of her sins, and that you may not receive of her plagues."

From this passage I infer two things—1st. That you consider all the Protestant sects in christendom a part of the beast, or antichristian power, described by St. John in his book of Revelation, and also in other parts of the Bible. 2d. That you believe yourself and brethren to be the favored individuals who are employed by Providence to usher in the long expected Millennium.

That I do not misrepresent your meaning in the above passage, is evident from the fact, that you have expressed the same sentiments in language that cannot be mistaken, in other parts of your writings.

In Mill. Harbinger, vol. 2, p. 54, you give us some incidents of a tour to Nashville, Ten. where you say, "From Lexington we proceeded to Athens. A large and attentive audience were addressed in that place on the subject of the present apostacy. Paul's prophecy in his 2d letter to the Thessalonians, and that of John in the 17th and 18th chapters of the Revelations, were read with a view to mark the prominent characteristics of the mystery of iniquity. The rise, progress, and present state of the apostacy were briefly noticed. Considerable emphasis was laid upon the frontispiece of the Mother of Harlots, mounted upon a monstrous beast, having seven heads and ten horns. The topmost word upon her forehead next arrested our attention. The large capitals upon her tiara, which spell Mystery, were shown to be not only the first in place, but in importance in discriminating this *Babylonish Mistress* from all the paramours of the kings of the earth. The mystic doctrines and mysterious meanings ascribed to the apostolic writings were shown to be the instrument by which the woman mounted the seven-headed and ten-horned beast; in other words, the means by which Antichrist first gained the ascendant, and by which Babylon the Great was reared.

"The Protestant Reformation was shown to be more political than religious, and to have issued in giving to christendom many Protestant Popes for one Catholic Pope. The well-meant efforts of Luther were shown to have been frustrated in part by the friends of reformation and the schemes of statesmen; and that though he gave the people a new version of the Scriptures and exhorted them to read them, still the rules of interpreting and quoting them by the papistical Doctors were substantially adopted by the friends and coadjutors of Martin, and thus his reformation eventuated in the mere change of creeds and masters, as England and Scotland unequivocally demonstrate.

"The Augsburg Confession, though accidentally made an authoritative creed, was shown to have been made the platform of a politico-ecclesiastic establishment, as fleshly, sensual, and, for its opportunity,

as bloody as that of the mother whose daughter it was. The Wesleyan Reformation of Protestant Episcopacy was shown to be only the daughter of the daughter of the old Queen, who boasted that she was not yet a widow. Wesley and Fletcher had reformed the doctrines and discipline of Episcopacy, it was admitted; but their efforts ended in a *five-headed* priesthood. Metropolitan Bishops and Archbishops, with swords by their sides, were discarded; but diocesan prelates, presiding elders, circuit riders, local preachers, and class leaders, with the discipline and conferences, local and general, had not done much more for heaven or earth than the German reformer had done for King Harry and his worthy realm of England.

"The times in which we live prove louder than argument, that all these reformations issue in a state of society very unlike that which christianity contemplates. We have only to notice *the fruits* of these systems to be assured that the tree is not that planted by the Great Husbandman. The word of God is virtually made of non effect by these sectarian dogmas and traditions." In another page you mention, among the innumerable evils flowing from the sectarian establishments, "their inefficiency in purifying the heart, because they are all destitute of an *institution that gives a formal and sensible and perfect remission of sins*." And, again, "The Calvinian and Arminian gospels (by which I suppose you mean the Methodists) permit those who believe them, only to pray we hope we shall be pardoned, because we felt thus and so." Now, my dear sir, in remarking on the above passages, it is not my intention to draw you into a controversy about the truth or falsehood of the points at issue between you and your Protestant brethren; but to invite your candid attention to the very unchristian manner in which you have expressed yourself. Had you told us you believed yourself specially raised up to usher in the Millennium—that you were about a great work, and that you deeply lamented the ignorance and errors of your Protestant brethren, I could have smiled at your enthusiasm, and passed it by with pleasantry. It is not uncommon for the leaders of sects to over-rate their importance and speak extravagantly of their doings and prospects.

I have heard this thing ever since I was a boy. Every new sect has proclaimed its superlative excellency. Some enthusiastic Methodists have talked in this wild way. With them Methodism was not only a good thing, but every thing. "Methodism," they have cried out, "will sweep the world and soon usher in the Millennium." I was quite amused a few years ago, when two young Cumberland Presbyterians came to Washington, Pa. to circulate their peculiar principles. One of them, when recommending to a large congregation the superior excellence of his opinions over those of Calvin and Wesley, said, the age in which those reformers lived was dark when compared with ours. This he illustrated by comparing the old keel-boats and trail-paths of our fathers with the fine steam-boats and rail-roads of the present day. The moral was obvious. With him Cumberland Presbyterianism was a steam-boat, or rail-road way to hea-

ven, compared with the system of religion believed by other sects. It may be so, indeed; but, I hope, dear sir, that you will not consider it a sin against the Holy Spirit if I am a little sceptical and tardy about taking a passage in these religious conveyances to the good world until I see how they work. I must still linger in the old path so long as I can see the track of my Master, and if it should lead me over rugged mountains and through deep vallies, like Great Heart in Bunyan, I will cheer up and look out for the heavenly city.

One hundred and fifty years ago Robert Barclay addressed Charles II. of England, in the following language. "To Charles II. King of Great Britain and the dominions thereunto belonging—Robert Barclay, a servant of Jesus Christ, called of God to the dispensation of the gospel, now again revealed, and after a long and dark night of apostacy, commanded to be preached to all nations—wishes health and salvation." According to this good Quaker, the peculiar tenets of his party are to be considered "the gospel again revealed." He stands before us as a harbinger of the Millennium. Now, my dear sir, after so many disappointments in relation to the long expected Millennium, I must say I am a little sceptical and slow to believe what the Prophets of our day say. I have never been favored with any of those blessed elevations of hope. I am, indeed, much attached to the institutions of the church to which I belong, and believe she is contributing her full share in bringing about the regeneration of the world. I rejoice in her great and every day increasing prosperity. But, to this day, I cannot believe that all the world will ever become Methodists. But I am willing, friend Campbell, that you should believe that you are the angel represented by John flying in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting good news to proclaim; and that your institutions, or those you plead for, will obtain over all the earth—that our poor old church, after lingering awhile, will at last expire and give place to what you call "the ancient gospel." Virtuous enthusiasm I know is often connected with much goodness of character. The mad astronomer, in Rasselas, I believe is not charged by the philosopher with being defective in goodness of heart, but in over-rating his importance in human concerns. What I object to is, the unchristian spirit you manifest towards your brethren. You not only represent us as laboring under great error, but belonging to the Whore of Babylon, the Mother of Harlots. We are all, without distinction, held up to the world as an *impure brood*, who have abused the mercies of Heaven. We are unchurched. You lift the warning voice, and call on all to come out of us. Now, my dear, sir, is it possible that you can believe yourself justified in applying such language to your Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, and Episcopalian brethren? Admitting us to be in error—that we are rather tardy in reforming—do you really think that, in relation to good Christian morals, practical piety, we are actually so wilfully corrupt that you can apply to us the strong language of the inspired writers when describing the church in her most degraded state? Is his your serious belief? And do you think that there is such a great difference between

the practice of your followers and that of other professors of religion in our country, as to justify you in holding out the idea that you and your followers, by your labors, are indeed bringing in the reign of righteousness? Dare you say that your followers are more famed for piety, humility, justice, and general benevolence, than the Methodists and other denominations in this country? Are they more wise and less bigoted—more zealous to spread the knowledge of salvation over the earth? If they are not, how will you justify yourself to your God in using such harsh language in speaking of us? I know the inspired writers often make use of strong language when rebuking vice; but never, I believe, when reforming error. But I do not think that any uninspired man should think himself at liberty to use the strong language of Christ when abusing hypocrites. Jesus knew what was in man; but this knowledge, my dear sir, neither you nor I possess. The intemperate language of Luther and many of the reformers, when declaiming against the church of Rome, is not reckoned by Dr. Campbell, and other writers, among their virtues. Calvin added nothing to his wisdom or virtue by calling his opponents *hogs*, and their objections to his unreasonable doctrines of reprobation *impudent calumnies, the murmurs of impiety.* Nor is Luther more highly esteemed by the wise and good for calling his antagonists *devils.*

J. A. WATERMAN.

[*To be continued.*]

Reply to Mr. Waterman.

My Dear Sir,

I EXPECTED from a minister of so much reputation for good sense and sound logic, something more manly, sensible, and edifying—something more useful and interesting—something more direct on some of the great and cardinal questions of this age, than this cheap, common-place, canting sort of exegesis of sectarian charity, than this gratuitous imputation of a visionary and fantastic character, than this catering for the vitiated taste of a licentious and sceptical generation. How much more rational, argumentative, and edifying to have discussed some of the great principles of the Christian system, which are opposed to those narrow and restricted bonds of union, which unite a few against the many, and perpetuate the jars and discords of men of other times and other circumstances, and buttress the decaying walls of separation for no other use than the multiplication of the votaries of some favorite antiquated shibboleth.

What has my charity to do with the truth or falsehood of my views of religious faith or practice? Are we to decide upon the weight of a man's person by the color of his hair, or on the strength of his logic by his taste for music? Is a man a grammarian because he loves oysters, or a rhetorician bacause he is lenient to the faults of his wife?

'Tis easy, very easy, my dear sir, for a person of a little tact to place the most benevolent enterprize along with some visionary

scheme, and to ridicule the former by the abortions of the latter. But ridicule is not the test of truth, else Voltaire and Bolingbrooke would have laughed the gospel out of the world before we came upon the stage.

When a person writes for fame every thing depends upon his choice of a subject. And although you are above suspicion, you have fortunately chosen a subject on which you cannot fail to be most acceptable to all sects: for, however you may succeed in the *allegata* and *probata*, you cannot fail to be rewarded with the smiles of all who are in great need of the charity of their acquaintance. There is nothing more popular in an age of delinquency than charity; and every one will plead its cause with a zeal which is proportioned to his conciousness of degeneracy.

There is but one character who is out of the pale of the charity of all who plead its cause in the present crisis. To him alone is all charity to be denied who speaks against the latitudinarianism of the age. I should imagine from the whole document, a part of which only appears in the present number, that charitable as you are, (and in this most popular attribute you are now very conspicuous) it would be easier for you to make a saint of Dr. Priestly or Wm. Cobbett, than of your humble servant. I may possibly succeed in my remarks on the yet unpublished part of your long and ingenious letter, to convince even yourself, if indeed you are not now sensible of it, that in the inverse ratio of every one's zeal for the whole institution of Jesus Christ, is he the object of that charity which obtains the admiration of the thoughtless multitude. So evident is this to me, that if I could imagine one who is wholly without the pale of sectarian charity, he would be a perfect disciple of Jesus Christ.

But, sir, are you not inconsistent with yourself while you accuse me of uncharitableness? No one can imagine that you would have addressed to me a letter so singular and characteristic of intolerance towards my proceedings, who had not a high conception of the extent of my charity. The single fact that you have requested me to publish an epistle condemnatory of my whole course of procedure in one very important matter—an epistle which not a Methodist editor in the United States would print in his own periodical respecting his editorial labors, were it from my pen, or perhaps from any other, furnishes an imperishable monument, that while you, for some special purpose, accuse me of uncharitableness, you sincerely, or in heart, regard me as possessing a degree of charity of the higher and more noble character which is wholly unprecedented in the present generation. In my future remarks on your letter, I shall give some striking instances of the truth of this observation.

But to examine your two *inferences* from the first quotation from the Extra on Regeneration, and which you have attempted to sustain by other quotations; you will, on a little reflection, perceive that although the first is partially, or at least plausibly sustained, the second is not found in your premises. If there be any foundation for your second inference, it is because you regard all persons who plead

for reformation as believing themselves raised up by Providence to introduce a new and better era in the world. This will of course be an inference equally true of John Wesley, John Calvin, or any other reformer, popular or unpopular. But admitting this to be your view of this matter, your premises are not in your quotations; but in your own peculiar mode of reasoning.

I do not think that any person in all the ranks of the reformation for which we contend, believes himself specially raised up to introduce the Millennium. Indeed, sir, our views of the Millennium are very far from such a conceit. We are rather inclined to think that the Millennium will be introduced in one day by the Lord himself, as you might more logically infer from the five essays of Daniel in the 1st volume of this work. As the Jewish and Christian institutions began in one day, so it is presumed that the reign of the Messiah on earth for a thousand years, will also commence on one day. That a people will be prepared for such an event, we doubt not; and that the orignal gospel will be proclaimed to all the human race before that day, is not impossible. In so far, then, as the restoration and proclamation of the primitive institution is preparatory to that great and glorious day of the Lord, and in so far as any portion of christendom are engaged in this good work, so far, and only so far, are they to be regarded as "hasting the coming of the day of the Lord;"—as harbingers of the approaching reign on earth of the Saviour of the world. This, my dear sir, is the maximum of our ambition. We desire to be found by the Lord when he comes to reign on earth, or when we appear before him, waiting his coming, and not like those who say the master delays his coming and engage in abusing their fellow servants—not like the imprudent, but like the prudent virgins who had *oil* as well as *lamps*.

With regard to your first inference, as there is some plausibility that in the main it is logical and just, I beg your attention. I do not indeed say that every sect in christendom has formed alliances with the governments of this world; but that all who seek, have sought, or would accept such an alliance, are the legitimate offspring of the ecclesiastic wild beast of the Apocalypse.

You, of course, regard all sects, Catholic, Greek, and Protestant, as the true spouse, and acknowledged church of Christ—branches of your Zion—your fellow Christians, "*in the judgment of charity*"—brethren in Christ. This is a fair inference from your logic; for you present this as a proof of my "very *unchristian* spirit," because I say to those in these sects who fear God, Come out of them. You, on the contrary, being so *charitable*, say, Stay where you are: for you are as acceptable to God by continuing in any of these sects, as though you came out and united with the Methodists. Indeed, your Christian spirit is quite at war with your own party: for while the spirit of the sect says, 'Make Methodists,' your christian spirit says, 'No; they are all the Lord's people—as good Christians as we Methodists are.'

I might, indeed, excuse you for proselyting a few infidels, or non-

professors, to Methodism; but if ever you persuade a Presbyterian, an Episcopalian, or Catholic to separate from these communities and join your party—then you exhibit a very unchristian spirit, and are just as uncharitable as you would represent myself! Did this escape you, or do you think that an unchristian spirit belongs to any other system or operation by a sort of chemical affinity, rather than to Methodism; and that a Methodist must possess a very Christian spirit, while every other spirit that imitates it is most unchristian?

But you will say, 'I except the Catholics.' Well, be it so. This is a great speck upon your Christian spirit. But you will say, 'There are spots in the sun.'

Well, let us ask a few of those invidious questions which you gravely and charitably propound to me. Will you unchurch the good Catholic—the honest Greek? Wherein does the Quaker, the good Episcopalian, or the pious Presbyterian, excel the good Catholic, or the good Greek? Will not the morals of the followers of John Calvin bear a comparison with the followers of John Wesley? What advantage has the Methodist over any other sectary in point of sincerity, honesty, and good behaviour? This is your own logic: for if I should not in an egotistic and boasting spirit, adduce a long series of superlative excellencies amongst those who unite with me in Reformation, you forthwith reply—'Why then do you call upon us Methodists to come out of Babylon?' It is a good rule that works both ways. Why then not apply your definition of a charitable and christian spirit first to yourself before you try it upon me? You have been inviting, persuading, and beseeching men to worship at your altar in preference to any other. Of course, then, you must look upon all sects in a very unchristian spirit, or you have been trifling with men's best interests. If you say that the good Calvinist and the good Arminian are equally acceptable to God and profitable to men—why preach Arminianism rather than Calvinism? And if you say they are not, why do you judge so uncharitably, and exhibit so little of the Christian spirit?

But in what attitude would a contrary hypothesis place you? Suppose you to be as charitable as you appear, what honor do you give to your intellect? Is it compatible with the higher powers of your nature, that you have spent so many years in serious trifling, in building up a party which is as unnecessary as a fifth wheel to a coach—inasmuch as there is no good reason why any sectary should come out of any party, in order to be more acceptable to God or useful to men. You do not think so of your life, I am well assured. Therefore, the difference between you and myself in this matter is, you preach charity and practise according to my uncharitable spirit, while I practise according to the charity which I preach. I will, I trust, before we finish this subject, enable all my readers to see what means a Christian spirit, and what true charity is. So far I speak in accordance with your style, and rather as pre artory to my reply, which I hope to prosecute as opportunity may pefrmit.

EDITOR.

Conversation at Mr. Fowler's.

Continued from page 613, *vol.* iv.

Mrs. Fowler.—I AM, like Mr. Williamson, fully convinced that in training children the first object is *the body;* for without a vigorous and healthy body, all knowledge and every attainment, intellectual or moral, is, in a great measure, useless to the community. I believe also that temperance and health are very closely related, and that the indulgence of the appetites of our children, according to the present fashion, debilitates their frames, impairs their intellectual powers, and strengthens only their passions and their appetites. But I wish for some more information on the subject of their moral and religious training.

Mr. Reed.—That is a part of the question which is referred to Father Goodal. It is he whom we expect and wish to hear on this subject. His experience, observation, and success give him the precedency on this, as on most other subjects.

Father Goodal.—I have read some volumes and heard some sermons on this great and responsible duty, without much improvement; and I fear that a relation of my thoughts and experience would become as dry as any prosing commentator.

Mr. Reed.—Nothing from Father Goodal can be dry or uninteresting on any moral or religious subject; and on this one especially, we promise ourselves nothing but edification.

Father Goodal.—If, then, I must proceed, I will seek for one word which will express the whole subject. You may teach them to commit the Scriptures to memory, to be quiet, sober, modest, and prayerful; but without this one word, your teaching will all be in vain. 'Tis EXAMPLE alone—which gives meaning, force, beauty, and pertinency to precept. Children are the most imitative creatures in all creation. Their language, pronunciation, countenance, gait, and modes of thinking and acting, spring not from precept, but from example.

Mr. Williamson.—While I can imagine that their language and pronunciation are acquired by imitation, I am at a loss to understand how their countenance can be formed either by precept or example.

Father Goodal.—By the *countenance* I mean not merely the face, the eyes, forehead, cheeks, and mouth; but that *something* which sits upon the face, called *expression*, which indicates the soul, and speaks to the eye all that is in the heart. Solomon says a person's wisdom gives him a shining face, or "makes his face to shine." The countenance is that irradiation of the face, that light and glowing innocence and beauty, which sparkles in the eye, beams from the forehead, and which expresses sentiment and disposition. This is the offspring of education, and is acquired by the assimilating influence of virtuous example.

Mr. Williamson.—Then, Father Goodal, you would have all children of a beautiful countenance if their parents would do their duty! But now tell me in good earnest, can a face, naturally *homely*, as we Americans express it, be made beautiful by good education? Am I to attribute all the loveliness I see in a certain beautiful face over the table, to nature or education?

Father Goodal.—I am pleased with the jocularity of my friend Williamson; but as I am quite serious in this matter, I would have the attention of the company fixed on the power which our Heavenly Father has given us over the whole persons and fortunes of our children. And let me add, in confirmation of the argument, that while I have seen some pretty faces darkened with ignorance, blackened with crime, and deformed with vice, I never saw an intelligent and religious youth that was not beautiful in my sense of that word. Admit that there are lines and proportions in some faces not in accordance with those models which the fancy of our English nation pronounce beautiful; yet when the light of intelligence, the beauty of innocence, and the graces of heaven-born piety shed their lustre over those crooked lines, those unequal

proportions, they make the rough places smooth, the crooked lines straight, and all irregularities agreeable, and clothe the whole with the charms of excellence.

Mr. Reed.—My observation fully corroborates yours, Father Goodal. Beauty is in the idea—it is wholly in the mind. Love hides a multitude of blemishes; and loveliness of character covers all the defects of the face. It does more—the beauty of the soul adorns the face as much as our passions disfigure it.

Mr. Reed.—Well, indeed, this is a new view of the matter. This would seem a new argument in favor of the education of our daughters. I think if our neighbor (Mrs. Cohen) heard this, it would do more to convert her to religion than all the exhortations of her Parson Levi. Besides, the girls themselves might be induced to turn their attention more to morals, and less to fashion.

Mrs. Fowler.—I am afraid their features are too well fixed, and their habits too much confirmed, to yield to any moral cause.

Father Goodal—My daughters, be admonished that you are not to make light of this matter, nor to allow yourselves to be laughed out of it; for as certain as Solomon's Proverbs are true, a good education imparts real beauty to the whole person of man or woman. Of the true wisdom Solomon says, "It shall be an ornament of grace to your head, and chains about your neck;" and Paul exhorts Christians to *adorn* themselves with good works. But you must begin to this work betimes; for—

"As the twig is bent the tree's inclin'd."

Mrs. Reed.—Would Father Goodal then tell us what he comprehends under this word *example?*

Father Goodal.—With pleasure I will give you my reflections upon the nature and power of good example. Example, in my acceptation, implies neither more nor less than the practice of the good instructions which we can so easily communicate in the preceptive form. Most religious parents give good advices and wholesome instructions to their children, even to many who in after life become reprobates; but they did not practise before their children what they preached. Mrs. Gatewood, for example, was daily lecturing her children against pride and extravagance. I called in one evening after the return of herself and husband from a marriage in Newtonfields. She, in the presence of her daughters, then almost young women, was expatiating to Mrs. Shephard on the gaiety of the party, and concluded by saying that she was so plain she was *ashamed* to appear at the wedding. So soon as she pronounced the word *ashamed,* Sophia exclaimed, "Well, mother, ought one to be *ashamed* of being plain?" She felt the rebuke; and, looking to me, said, "How easy is it to make void our own good instructions!" Thus I have observed many parents who abounded in good instructions, and were anxious to see their children act the part of wisdom, make void all their lessons by a single action, or an unseasonable and improper word. Mrs. Wilkins was always rebuking her children for carrying home tales from school, and yet she always entertained her friends by telling the failings of her neighbors!

By good example, then, I mean the practice of every precept which we enforce upon our children—not occasionally, but constantly—not partially, but fully.

The most common error which I have observed among parents is their aptness to think their children do not reason from one action to another, or understand the meaning of looks, words, and actions so early as I have proved that they do. They do read the faces of father and mother before they can learn the letter A. They reason analogically before we think they can reason at all.

Mrs. Reed.—Of this I have no doubt. I was astonished at the shrewdness and imitativeness of early infancy in an incident which occurred a few months ago. The Monday after Mr. Wallace baptized Mr. Walker's infant son John, I was passing from one room into another, where I found my son William, only six years old, in the act of baptizing a kitten, which Jane Fowler held in her arms. Jane had taken up a large cat, which she could not hold in the proper

attitude. "Throw it down," said William, "the cat is too large to be baptized; catch the kitten—it is little cats that ought to be baptized." Jane caught the kitten, and was carrying it forward to William, who had some milk in a tea-cup; and when Jane approached him in a slow and solemn step, William exclaimed, "Where is the father of the kitten? It is the father who should hold up the child." Jane, turning towards James Mitchell, only six months older than herself, said, "Here is Miss Mary's father." James took the kitten, and William was just beginning to say, "I baptize thee"——when I suddenly appeared and prevented him from proceeding. "What are you about, my children," I exclaimed. They were all silent. After the panic was over, Jane said, "William has been preaching, and we were baptizing the kitten that it might be good. You know, Aunt Reed, the old cat kills the birds; but now the little cat will be good."

I was overwhelmed, and knew not what to say; and only replied, "My good children, kittens are not to be baptized; but I will explain this to you at some other time."

Mr. Williamson.—I recollect to hear my father tell of an infant in New York, the daughter of a Catholic lady, who, at the age of three years, asked her mother, 'How long were the ears of the Virgin Mary, and could she both see and hear in the dark?' And on another occasion, shortly after, inquired, 'Were all the Fridays in the year *bad*, and but one *good* Friday?" However, this child was, like many others, too wise and good to live long; for it died of the small pox in its seventh year.

Father Goodal.—Volumes might be filled with proofs, and anecdotes, and illustrations of the timous dawnings of reason and the early display of the imitative powers of infancy and childhood; but if the present company is fully persuaded of it, we need not multiply proofs. The moral or the inference, then is, that those who would have their offspring to be wise, virtuous, pure, and happy, must begin betimes—and not in theory or in precept, but by example teach them to avoid every evil, and practise every good.

Mr. Reed.—But you would not leave it all to *example*, and nothing to precept, Father Goodal?

Father Goodal.—No; but I would make the precept follow, and explain the example, rather than the example recommend the precept. This prominence would I give; for the example prepares the mind better for the precept, than the precept for the example.

Mrs. Fowler.—Could you suggest a better way of teaching the Holy Scriptures to our children, than by causing them to memorize them? Sometimes I fear that tasking them every day will give them a dislike to the book.

Father Goodal.—Cannot children be made to like any thing? One, indeed, may make them like or dislike any thing. You can even make pleasure a pain if you carry it on to satiety, or beyond a certain limit. My plan was to make it as much the business and the pleasure of every day, as washing the face or combing the hair. These become, by habit, pleasing exercises.

I never enjoined but one complete period per day, and made all beyond that a free-will offering. But I held out inducements by conferring rewards on those who abounded in these oblations. Such was the ambition, and finally the love for the Book of Blessings, that when I called my family together in the evening, each child would repeat a whole chapter, and this every evening for a month in succession. But I always took care not to make it irksome, until their affection was won. And, indeed, it was a primary object to require them often to repeat an epistle, or a section of one of the sacred books, when they had repeated it in small portions at a time. Otherwise the forgetting and the getting might finally balance the year. My maxim in this business was that of the miser—"*Get all you can, and keep all you get.*" In the morning I read what I thought suitable for the times and the seasons; but in the evening assembly of my family we all repeated. To encourage my children, I tasked myself daily, and repeated with them. And now, when my eyesight fails me, I am reaping the fruits of my former labors. I often lay awake an hour or two

in the night, and when I ride or walk out by myself, I can read Paul's epistles and muse upon them, if there were not a copy of the good book within a thousand miles of me.

Mr. Reed.—That is a good thought, Father Goodal. If the Testament were burned, I think I could find some half dozen of persons from whom we could make out a copy.

Mrs. Goodal.—Ought not the Old Testament to be as carefully studied as the New; or are not Moses, and David, and the Prophets worthy of a place in our memories and our hearts, as well as the Christian Apostles?

Mr. Reed.—Most certainly.—The beauties of Moses, of David, of Isaiah, and all the Prophets, ought to be laid up in the memories of all who desire to be filled with the spirit of knowledge, and of the highest and most sublime devotion.

Father Goodal.—The whole Bible, to every man, is just what he remembers of it; and what is not in his mind is, to him, as though it were not in the world. But let me add, in the work of laying it up in the memory there ought to be *method*.

Mr. Reed.—A word or two on *method*, Father Goodal, if you please.

Father Goodal.—With all my heart. But some are asking for a song. Let us, then, relieve ourselves with a song. What shall it be?—

"How precious is the Book Divine,
By inspiration given"——

Mr. Reed. That is to the point.

EDITOR.

Catholic Controversy---No. 3.

THE third and fourth letters of this controversy contain only a reiteration of the arguments demonstrative that the Protestant rule of faith is not the Catholic rule, and that the Catholic rule of faith is not the Protestant rule; and, in truth, that neither of them has much, or any thing to do with the faith of God's elect. The sophism of the phrase "*rule of faith*," not only pervades the whole volume, but occasions at least half the words found on 470 octavo pages. But for the illusion, or delusion of this phrase, I know not what the gentlemen could have got to debate about. Neither of them approach within a hundred miles of the real merits of dispute between a Christian and a Roman Catholic.

To set this matter in a familiar and intelligible attitude before the mind of the reader, we shall suppose the controversy to have been about the rule of faith in reference to the rise and progress of the Jewish state. One disputant affirms that the rule of faith is the authentic history of the rise and progress of the Jewish state, as found in the writings of Moses, Joshua, Samuel, and the Records of the Kings of Israel and Judah. His opponent says, No; it is the commentators, critics, and translators of those writings, and the explanations of them found in all the writings of the Rabbims for 1500 years—as condensed and concocted in the brains of Rabbi Gamaliel and his successors in office.

P, the Protestant, says to C, the Catholic: Sir, we shall define our terms, and set matters in a more tangible form before our minds.

What, sir, is the meaning of the word *faith?* Is it equivalent to the word *literature, criticism, science, doctrine,* or what? Say it is general literature or science, and I can talk with you; but until I know what you mean by this word *faith,* I cannot tell what is the *rule* of it. According to your definition of the term, will be my affirmations and negations. What says the Dictionary? To it we appeal. Hand me Mr. Walker. "*Faith,*" says Mr. Walker, "is belief of the revealed truths of religion; the system of revealed truths held by the Christian church; trust in God; tenet held; trust in the honesty or veracity of another; unshaken adherence, honor, social confidence, sincerity, honesty, veracity, promise given." Here are *twelve* meanings: take your choice. Before I decide, says C, I wish you to define "*belief,*" or "*to believe.*" *Belief,* with me, replies P, is confidence in the veracity or testimony of any witness—a persuasion that any one speaks the truth. To have faith in any testimony, and to believe that testimony, are, with me, of one and the same significance. Grant it, says C; and then I affirm that faith is the persuasion that any system of doctrine is true, and metonymically it may be used for the truth believed, as well as the belief of it. P.— All this is evident; but as we want to make all the world understand this subject, I want something still more intelligible; and, therefore, to keep to the question before us concerning the rise and progress of the Jewish state, what do you mean by a belief or faith in that? C.—I mean a conviction that I understand the Jews' religion; that I rightly apprehend the meaning of all that is found in these writings. P.—That is *knowledge,* not *faith.* You can find no such definition of the word *faith* in any Dictionary in the world. It is not one of the *twelve,* and they are as latitudinarian as the whole compass of our language. This is your sophism without disguise. You want commentators, infallible expositors, to guide your understanding—not witnesses or evidences to produce assurance! Who, in a question of fact or faith, would ask for *interpreters* rather than *witnesses?* Would you thus attempt to prove a question of fact before a jury? Come, you must select a definition agreeable to the meaning of the word. Try it again. C.—I mean a persuasion that all that is written of the rise and progress of that state is true. P.—Grant it; and then I ask, what can be the rule, or reason, or measure of that faith or certainty, but what is written in the authors who testify concerning it? Is not the measure of my faith in these witnesses as in all others—namely, whatever is testified by Moses, Joshua, Samuel, &c.? Can any person who was born after that state declined testify any thing about its rise and progress, but from the documents which the original and contemporary witnesses handed down? In the nature of things, then, it is impossible that the rule or measure of my faith authoritatively—in latitude, longitude, extent, or certainty, can be the testimony of any one person or community that lived in some remote corner of the earth after that state was broken to pieces and scattered to every wind, but simply and exclusively the contemporary witnesses or historians. Apply this mode of reasoning to the rule or measure of the *belief* of Christians, and is it not equally applicable and conclusive?

But, says C, how do you, in this age, come at the testimony of contemporary historians? Just as I come into the possession of the history of England, in England—of the history of the United States, in the United States. In every civilized nation we find in itself its own records. Thus I receive from the Jews their history, independent of all the other nations or sects in existence. In the nations acknowledging Jesus to be the Messiah we find the records of that religion; and amongst the Mahomedans we find the Koran the records of their faith and their history. The testimony of Jews, of Christians, of Mahomedans must be examined without the authority of those who believe it, unless by authority something else than their faith in it be meant; for evidently no man of sense will expect another to believe upon his belief; or to make his faith a reason for the faith of another. This logic would be as sound in Turkey as in Rome. This very obvious and rational position strangles the whole Catholic argument about the authority of the church.

Mr. Hughes often asserts that without the tradition of the church of Rome, no man can believe the Apostles. "No person," says he, "can prove the Bible to be from God from itself alone." The authority of the church is with him essential to faith in the Apostles. So is the authority of the Mosque necessary to faith in the Koran—and so is the authority of the Jews essential to faith in the Pentateuch!!

Now if any one can believe the testimony of Moses and the Prophets without the Popes of Rome, the priests, the councils, and the unwritten traditions of that community; if any one can disbelieve the Koran and reject it as a fraud without the church of Rome; why can he not test the pretensions of the Christian religion without the authority of the church of Rome? Has not this thing been done in countless instances?

What is the rule of faith among the Jews? The testimony of Moses and the Prophets and their religious institutions: no matter how abused, no matter how perverted, they are still irrefragable evidences of the divine legation of Moses. *Testimony*, then, whether Jewish or Christian, and not the criticisms or dissertations of Rabbis or Priests, must, in the nature of things, be the measure and the reason of faith; i. e. of *faith* properly so called.

But faith with the Catholic and Protestant Doctors (at least, with Mr. Hughes and Mr. Breckinridge) is *opinion*, or the *doctrines* of the Bible—not its facts. Hence they contend about the rule of faith "to *determine disputes* in the church about doctrines." And who has found such a rule? Disputes among Protestants and Catholics about *doctrines* are as rank and rife now as ever, and a rule which can settle these has never yet been found on earth. But as to the facts testified by the Apostles and Prophets, if there was no "Church of Rome," nor Protestant sect in being, we would, nevertheless, from the book itself—from its own predictions—its numerous internal evidences—as well as from the Jewish and Pagan contemporary writers —the early Christians, and from the first apostates; I say, from all these we are certain that we have not believed cunningly devised fables, when we believe in Jesus as the Messiah.

There is not a sensible man on earth whose faith in Jesus rests on the traditions of the Church of Rome; nor even on the Christian Scriptures alone. The Apostles relied not only or chiefly upon even their own powers to prove their mission. The *Prophets*, the Jewish Prophets, were their reliance—their chief witnesses. For my part, I am incomparably more indebted to Moses and the Prophets—to the Jews, living and dead, for my confidence in God and my hope in Jesus, than to all the Catholics and Protestants in or near christendom.

The history of the Catholic sect written by Catholic hands is incomparably better adapted to make sceptics than believers in Christ. If the most abominable iniquities, lying, falsehood, juggling, sorcery, intrigue, persecution, murder, lust, passion, with the forms of religion, are the evidences that Jesus is the Son of God—then, indeed, may the Catholic superstition produce the full assurance of faith, and authorize the faith of the whole world.

In all my efforts to contend for the faith of the Bible, I never drew an argument from the Church of Rome but one—and that one was not very honorable to her pretensions. It is this: An apostacy so shameless, so extravagant, so blasphemous, so unprecedented, so unlike every feature of the gospel, requiring such a change in the politics of Rome—the policies of nations—the affairs of the whole world, from the times of Paul and John, to have been foretold by Paul, (2 Thes. ii.) and John in the Apocalypse—can leave no doubt, on any well informed mind, that the Spirit of God, who knows all things, guided the pen of the Apostles.

But to place the argument in another attitude before the mind, let us again examine the word *rule*; for it would seem as if by this word both Messrs. Hughes and Breckinridge meant more than measure, reason, or standard of belief—that they meant an infallible judge or authority to *settle disputes about doctrine*: that is, in one word, FAITH means *doctrine*, and RULE means *an authoritative judge*. But, perhaps, we had better pause here, and reflect for another month.

EDITOR.

Divorces.

C———, Ind. January 21st, 1834.

Brother Campbell,

A DIFFERENCE of opinion exists between two of the prominent members of the church at New Hope, in regard to the effect and operation of the passages found in Matth. xix. and 1 Cor. vii. upon the disciples.

Two cases in point have occurred in the church. The first was a husband, who was a disciple; his wife was not. She left him; he obtained a divorce, and married again. The church deemed him guilty of breaking a command, and withdrew from him. The second is the case of a female, whose husband left her several years ago for a cause unknown to any but himself. She since became a disciple; he was

not a member. She has since obtained a divorce, and is now married to a member of the church. This case is not yet acted upon; and to aid us in this matter, we ask your views.

Several of the disciples join me in requesting your immediate attention to this matter, that we may have the action of your opinion upon the minds of the brethren before it becomes unavoidable, under the circumstances, for the church to act.

Yours in the kingdom,

G. T.

REPLY.

Dear Brother,

THE cases which you state certainly merit very grave deliberation, and ought to be decided with a single reference to the revealed will of our King. On this subject there can be no difference in the judgment of the brethren with you. A difference of judgment or opinion there may be, and it seems there actually is, among you, as to what the revealed will of the Lord is. The Lord commanded some things and Paul commanded some things in reference to such cases, which it would appear at first difficult to reconcile.

The Lord says, (Matth. xix. 9.) "Whoever divorces his wife, except for whoredom, and marries another, commits adultery; and whoever marries the woman divorced, commits adultery." So Jesus, while a minister of the circumcision, decided a question referred to him by the Pharisees. To the same effect he speaks in the Sermon on the Mount. (Matth. v. 32.) "Whoever shall dismiss his wife, except for whoredom, is the occasion of her becoming an adulteress; and whoever marries her that is divorced, commits adultery." Luke (xvi. 18.) records the decision of the question referred by the Pharisees, in almost the same words found in Matth. xix. 9. These decisions would of course be final, though spoken with a reference to the Jewish institution, and while that institution was yet standing, had there not been any other law or regulation upon that subject since.

But since the kingdom of God was taken from the Jews and given to the Gentiles, and with a reference to the state of things in the Gentile world, at and since the introduction of Christianity, a society of Christians in the city of Corinth wrote to the Apostle to the Gentiles concerning the marriage covenant, and certain *things* connected with it, which it seems they could not satisfactorily adjust as the matters stood among them. This drew from the Apostle a decision of the matter which seems at first view to clash with the quotations made from Matthew and Luke.

Paul, after quoting a command from the Lord, and addressing it to the Christians, viz. "Let not a wife (that is, of course, a Christian) depart from her husband—immediately supposes that notwithstanding this injunction a case might occur in which a sister might depart from her husband without forfeiting her standing in the church, and immediately address her when departed with a command from the Lord to remain unmarried, or to be reconciled to her husband; and

in reference to a brother, who is a husband, he says, "he must not put away his wife."

But he adds, "The rest I command, not the Lord; if any brother has an infidel wife, who is well pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away." This is contrary to the commandment of the Lord given to the Jews under the antecedent dispensation; for they were commanded to put away their infidel wives, although they might be pleased to live with them. This commandment the Apostle also gives to every believing wife. This is Paul's commandment, and it is as obligatory as the Lord's; for in the conclusion of the whole matter he says, 'he has, in his own judgment, the Spirit of the Lord, although the Lord had not given any commandment on these matters.' But that which is most to the point and the cases before us, is verse 15. "But if the infidel party depart, let them depart; a brother or a sister, in such a case, is not in bondage." The marriage covenant is broken, and the believing party is free.

This permission being granted by the Apostle, and in accordance with the Spirit of God in reference to such cases, it seems to me that in all cases of voluntary desertion on the side of the unbelieving party, the marriage covenant is made void, and the believing party is to the deserter as though they had never been married.

But in the second case which you have laid before me, there is another consideration which bears directly upon it. The female was not a disciple when deserted by her husband, and having been divorced according to the law of the land before she became a disciple, if in that matter she had actually erred, she is not now to be repudiated for that error any more than one who formerly was a slanderer or a persecutor, and has been brought to repentance and reformation, is now to be rejected for crimes committed before his conversion. And if the divorce was obtained after she became a disciple, in order to conform to the statutes of the state, with express reference to her marriage, it seems not materially to alter the case: for if it clearly appears that she was in fact literally *deserted* by her former husband, she still comes under the operation of the decision of the Apostle—a sister in such a case is free, or not under bondage.

I would only add, that as it was in the kingdom of God among the Jews, so is it in the kingdom of God among the Christians. When both the parties are in the kingdom, then the husband who puts away his wife, or the wife who leaves her husband, except for whoredom, and who marries another, commits adultery; and whoever marries either of the parties, commits adultery, and is to be discarded from the Christian community. But in the cases before us, and in the decision of Paul upon such cases—one or both of the parties were not citizens of the kingdom of God when the desertion or separation occurred. All of which is respectfully submitted by one who has the honor to be your fellow citizen in the kingdom of God.

EDITOR.

P. S. I am happy to have the concurrence of brother Walter Scott, who is at this time here on a visit, in the judgment expressed in the

remarks, both on the case submitted and on the decision of such cases by our great Apostle Paul.

For the Millennial Harbinger.

Conscience---No. 2.

IN our first number we made a few general remarks upon the subject of *definition*, and briefly considered the great importance of having clear and correct definitions of terms in every science, more especially in that of religion. We shall now endeavor to obtain such a definition of the term *conscience.*

For this purpose we need not ransack the musty volumes of scholastic divinity. We need not ascend upon the wings of vain imagination into pure ether, nor plunge into the dark and mysterious depths of metaphysical lore. The Master introduced no new system of metaphysics or philosophy. In all matters relating to our holy religion, we have in him a better teacher than can be found among all the philosophers or doctors of divinity that the world has ever seen. A teacher who "knew what was in man," and who could not only scan the deepest recesses of the human heart, and discover the secret springs of human intellect; but who, in the plainest and most perfect manner—in language the most simple—in illustrations the most beautiful and appropriate, could reveal to the understanding the deep things of God, whether in nature or religion, and adapt them to the humblest capacity. This he accomplished by presenting things in the most simple and natural point of view, communicating a knowledge of things unknown through the medium of those with which his audience were already acquainted. Accordingly he (unlike our modern Doctors) invented no new terms. He was content to take the language of the people as he found it, and to express to them in their own words, in their common acceptation, the truths he taught.

Thus, perceiving in the heart of man the deep fountain of human misery, he labored to communicate this master truth to those who were perfectly conversant with external uncleanness, and purification under the law, by instituting a beautiful and striking analogy between the heart and the external man, and employing for illustration the inside and outside of a whited sepulchre—the inside and outside of the cup and the platter.

Taught by the same Spirit, the Apostles have imitated his example, and accordingly in the sacred scriptures we have presented to us a view of man, his powers and his relations, so plain and simple as to be easily understood by the most inferior and uncultivated mind. Every one knows that he is possessed of an external form which he calls his *body*, and that this body is gifted with certain natural powers or faculties, such as strength, beauty, agility, &c. or artificial attributes and appendages, as cleanliness, clothing, ornaments, &c. Every one also is conscious, that is, it is a matter of experience with

every one, that there is dwelling in this body a certain active and superior existence, whether he call it soul, spirit, or mind, which can be active while the body is at rest, which can think one thing while the lips and countenance are made to express another; which could compel the tongue of a Joab to say to Amasa, "Is it well with thee, brother?" while his hand (less hypocritical) stabbed him to the heart; which could cause the lips of a Judas to salute with a kiss him before whose all-seeing eye he stood revealed in reality a traitor, and which is thus not only a distinct part of man, but which has its own powers and qualities, such as gentleness, meekness, wisdom, &c. which no one could conceive to belong to the body. This, then, is just the simple view which the Scriptures present of man. They speak of "the inner man," and "the outer man," while by comparison and analogy, they make him fully acquainted with himself. Thus does the "outward man perish?" the "inner man is renewed day by day;" or can the outer man be adorned with gold, jewels or apparel to be admired by man, then the hidden man of the heart is to be adorned with the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, which is of great price in the sight of God.

How exceedingly simple this doctrine is; and when compared with it, how ridiculous appear the fine-spun metaphysical theories of human nature by our modern theologians! How vain and useless their abstract speculations upon mind and morals—speculations, whether erroneous or not, calculated only to perplex and darken the subject, and place it far beyond the reach of the common understanding!

To proceed, however, with the matter in hand, since the Scriptures furnish us with the simple division which we have just noticed, and as it is evident that conscience is something belonging to man, (for the Scriptures predicate of man that he has a conscience) and equally manifest that it is no attribute of the outer man, we conclude that it is something belonging to the inner man.

Some suppose that conscience is knowledge merely; but although knowledge be necessary to the exercise of conscience as we will show hereafter, it is evident from what is said of it, that it is not the thing itself. Conscience is represented as excusing and accusing, convicting and condemning, &c. functions which knowledge cannot perform, and which suppose a faculty, a power, or capacity. Nor, among the various faculties of the mind, is it difficult to determine to which the term *conscience* is applicable, since the duties which are represented as being performed by it, can be performed by no other than the faculty of judgment. Every human being is conscious that he possesses a faculty or power of judging both himself and others, and forming a decision upon his own or their conduct or character.—We find, however, the term *conscience* always used with reference to a peculiar application or exercise of this power of judging, viz. *to oneself*. The proper definition of it, then, will be, *the faculty of self-judgment;* or, as it is expressed by Mr. Locke, "The power of judging of the moral rectitude or pravity of our own actions."—This, indeed, is the common and obvious meaning of the word, and

we are not authorized to take it in any other than its common acceptation, since we have received no definition from the Holy Spirit. It has been well observed that the poor cottager, who reads the sacred oracles, having a single eye and an honest heart, and who is not acquainted with any language but his own, will more readily understand them than the erudite polemic, deeply versed in human learning and philosophy. The latter is full of metaphysics—he mysterizes, and seeks for far-fetched meanings. The former seeks no mysteries, and he finds none. ALUMNUS.

Notes on a Tour to New York---No. 6.

WE requested the brethren of the three societies, friendly to union, to meet at Lawrence street, on the evening after my address at Tammany Hall, being the 6th of December, that we might address them on the necessity of union and co-operation. The meeting was well attended, and various reasons were offered in favor of an immediate union of the three societies. The prayer of Jesus, usually called *the intercessory*, found in John xvii. was read.

The chief topic was, that *union and co-operation are essential to the conversion of the world.* I pray for all that believe on me, *through the testimony of the Apostles*, that they may be ONE—THAT THE WORLD MAY BELIEVE THAT THOU HAST SENT ME. To illustrate and enforce this lesson, we reminded the brethren that they had been for many years the professed disciples of Christ—that they had been meeting on every Lord's day, reading the Scriptures, teaching and exhorting one another, and keeping the ordinances with commendable zeal; but that they had exerted no influence upon their fellow-citizens; and, therefore, in ten years had scarcely been instrumental in bringing ten persons into the kingdom of God. Such an experience, we argued, ought to convince the most dogmatical that they were wholly at fault—that they were not the lights of the city—that the work of the Lord was not prospering in their hands—that, indeed, they were but cumberers of the ground. We added that they stood in our way in proclaiming the word; that we had to fight over their dead bodies; and that the more excellent their behaviour and the more respectable their attainments, the more they stood in the way of the cause of the Bible: for that some intelligent gentlemen the other day threw them in my way as an insuperable argument that the Bible alone would never unite Christians, or keep them together; 'For,' continued they, 'these are persons of good reputation for good sense, for their biblical attainments, and for Christian demeanor; yet, with all these excellencies, they cannot harmonize so far as to break the loaf together.' Now, brethren, I argued, if you were not so highly esteemed for good sense, and good information, and good character, I could have got out of the difficulty by alleging that it was owing to the want of these things that the Bible failed to bring you together and to keep you together.

Union is strength, and disunion is weakness. Operation is good, but co-operation is better. Unity founded on opinion, is as unstable as the wind. Unity founded on the mere force of circumstances and temporary interest, is like the momentary peace that obtained in Noah's ark amongst the antagonist natures of the animal creation. Union founded on kindred feelings and experiences, was self-love, and as fluctuating as the sea; but union based on the facts attested by the holy Apostles, was as stable as the mountains—firm as the everlasting hills. Over such an institution the gates of hades, the powers of death and darkness cannot prevail. These, with various other positions, illustrations, and arguments were exhibited and enforced by the speaker, and attentively and acceptably heard by the brethren. Measures were in agitation for effecting a union, and all seemed alive to the importance of union and co-operation.

On Saturday evening we continued our series of discourses in the Union Chapel, Mott street. Peter's speech before the Council, after his deliverance from prison, (Acts v. 29—32.) was the theme. The chief topics were—

1st. The concession or grant of reformation to Israel.

2d. The proposal of forgiveness of sins.

3d. The bestowment of the Holy Spirit on those who had obeyed him.

After a full development of these items, we thought the attentive part of our audience was now sufficiently informed to authorize us to tender an invitation and exhortation to prompt obedience.

We did so. Ten persons immediately came forward to confess the Lord. Two of the males had formerly been sceptics; one of them, indeed, an advocate of infidelity. The next morning, at 7 o'clock, being the Lord's day, we repaired to the East River, where, in the open air, we delivered an address on Christian immersion. Brethren Black and Hatfield immersed them into the ancient faith, which they severally confessed as they went down into the water. Greater joy on the part of some of the new converts is seldom witnessed, than appeared on that occasion.

After the immersion we repaired to the brethren meeting in Hudson street, where we enjoyed the ordinances of the family of God; and after the worship and reading of the morning, we addressed the church on the importance of attending to all relative duties—both to one another and to the world.

At 3 o'clock in the afternoon, according to appointment, we addressed a large assembly of gentlemen (though it rained) at Concert Hall, on the evidences of the gospel.

After a brief recapitulation of the preceding discourse in Tammany Hall, we *reasoned* with them for about an hour and a half on *reason* and *faith*.

1st. We attempted to demonstrate that reason without faith is wholly inadequate to guide man, in reference either to the present or the future.

2d. Justified the wisdom and philantropy of the Author of Revela-

tion in addressing it to faith, or to the capacity by which we receive almost all our useful knowledge.

The design of this discourse, like the preceding, was to disabuse the audience of their prejudices against the testimony of God, occasioned by the abuses of their own reason, and the abuses of the Bible by many teachers and professors of Christianity; and to prepare them for the candid examination of the direct evidences and arguments to be offered that evening in Tammany Hall in proof of the resurrection of Jesus.

Among the various arguments adduced under the first item of our discourse, was, the impotency and perfect inadequacy of reason to originate or decide any thing regarding religion confessed by the Sceptics themselves. Before me, I observed, was a number of gentlemen, who had the greatest advantages which the improved state of the science of this world afforded; whose minds were fully matured by many years reflection, and by all that philosophy could bestow; who confessed that to the present moment they could not theoretically or practically decide whether or not there was a God—an intelligent Creator, or whether nature was or was not eternal and unoriginated. Their own experience—indeed, their own consciousness, than which there is no higher evidence to them, might be most successfully appealed to in proof that reason, however enlightened and cultivated by natural science, was altogether incompetent to guide man to any certain knowledge of his origin or destiny.

Faith, on the contrary, was that capacity or power in man, to which this knowledge was addressed, and by which alone it could be acquired. Indeed, all our knowledge of the past, and of the present, except only the narrow horizon which comes under the cognizance of our senses, is derived through this channel.

Faith was then shown to be the most natural, universal, and powerful principle of action implanted in the human breast. To it the docility and tractability of our species was to be ascribed. It was shown to be as necessarily a condition of temporal life as of eternal life. The infant that believes not its parents, must be destroyed; for fire, or flood, or poison, or the wild beast must destroy every child that believes not its nurse or guardian. Why, then, object to the gospel because it makes faith and obedience a condition of eternal life, which in the constitution of nature and society is an essential condition of our animal life!

Testimony it was alleged is submitted to reason, and over it reason exercises the same jurisdiction which it exercises over the objects of sense. The attributes of testimony, like the attributes of any object of reason, may be ascertained with as much precision as the properties of things. We can discriminate the true from the false, in some matters, with difficulty; but, in other matters, with perfect certainty. Reason deciding that the testimony is true, is believing; reason deciding that the testimony is false, is disbelieving; reason unable to decide, is scepticism.

Testimony is only another name for the experience of others. Their experience, reported and believed, is our faith. Mr. Hume said he could not admit the testimony of a few in proof of a miracle, because it was contrary to universal experience. But how did he know what universal experience testified? By believing the testimony of a few!! The philosopher seems not to have been aware that universal experience was to be ascertained only by the belief of the experience of a few. Silence is not contradictory testimony. The testimony of two men can prove in a court of law an affirmative proposition—the testimony of ten thousand cannot prove a negative; still less can their *silence* prove any thing. Some sceptics, amongst whom Frances Wright was one, exclaim 'that Christians cannot offer as much evidence in favor of their faith as would be necessary to gain a plea in court of the value of ten dollars;' meaning that they had no witnesses of the resurrection of Jesus that could be admitted in a court of law—no living witnesses, the only witnesses that can be heard by a jury. Then is the property of the owners of the soil of this state and of much of this city not worth ten dollars, because the letters of most of the original purchasers, and indeed the original charter itself, cannot be proved by living witnesses, but as we prove the records of Christianity! Perhaps, after all the boasts of scepticism to the contrary, it is more dogmatical than even bigotry itself.

The impossibility of originating the idea of spiritual existence, and the notion of propitiation, altars, temples, priests, &c. without other aids than sensation, reflection, and imagination—without the Bible, finished this address.

At Tammany Hall, at 7 o'clock, the same evening, we delivered a discourse of more than two hours, to the largest assembly (according to common report) that ever convened there.

To prove that Jesus rose from the dead, was the burthen of this discourse. After reading some portions of the prophets as introductory, our exordium consisted of a refutation of the allegation that we Christians were chiefly indebted to our friends for our faith—that our testimony was *exparte*. This was attacked by shewing that the contrary was the fact—that the documents on which we chiefly relied were in the possession of our worst and most deadly enemies. The Jews, who crucified the Messiah and persecuted the first promulgers of our faith, had been the keepers of those records which ascertained the pretensions of Jesus for 1500 years before he was born, and still possess them. The writings of Moses, of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and indeed all the Prophets, were in their keeping, and translated into the Greek language; therefore, in the keeping of Jews and Pagans centuries before the Christ appeared.

Prophecy in its accomplishment was shown to be a standing miracle. Prophecy, when uttered, no evidence; but when accomplished, is as strong as demonstration itself.

Two specimens were given, in which it was impossible to prevaricate—in which there was no refuge from figure, vision, or symbol—because all was as literal and obvious as narrative itself.

One from Jeremiah, concerning the present state of the Jews, chap. xxix. 18. xxx. 11. xxxi. 35—37. pronounced 600 years before the Messiah; translated into Greek 280 years before the Christian era. Every one can now see the event in the present fortunes of the Jews.

The second was, the fate of all the nations which abused the Jews before the Christian era, from Dan. ii. and Jeremiah xxx. 11.

From these we proceeded to the capital fact on which Christianity rests—the resurrection of Jesus. Jew, Gentile, and Christian alike admit his death and burial; but Christians only believe in his resurrection.

The fact that the body was missing on the third day, admitted. His friends had it not in keeping: for they did not expect his rising, as the four testimonies declare; and if they had, they could not have got it, for their enemies guarded the sepulchre. His enemies had it not, because they would have satisfied the populace of the fraud of his disciples in asserting his resurrection, and have confronted them with the dead body.

The body was, then, not to be found amongst friends or foes; and at this time there were no neutrals in Jerusalem. What came of it? It was reanimated—

1st. Because his disciples saw him repeatedly; heard him speak, and for forty days had such infallible proofs of his identity, as to sacrifice their lives in asserting his resurrection. All history affords no example of one or more individuals sacrificing their lives for asserting a *fact*, an *event* which promised them no earthly honor or reward.

2d. The descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost in presence of the nation assembled in Jerusalem, in attestation of his reception in heaven, and the consequent progress of the gospel over the world.

3d. The commemorative institution of a figurative *burial* and *resurrection* into the name of the Messiah, and the consecration of one day in every week to commemorate his resurrection, furnishes an argument of the highest moral certainty, for no commemorative or monumental institution set up at the time of any alleged fact and afterwards perpetuated, has in the history of all time proved fallacious. Indeed, it cannot be done. We could not do it now is an irrefragable argument that they could not do it then.

4th. The myriads of opponents, Jews, Samaritans, Pagans, who were overcome and vanquished into the belief of the resurrection, are equivalent to the testimony of myriads of adversaries; for it was a question of fact which was to be decided by evidence. Hence every vanquished opponent in that day, when every thing was fresh, is justly to be regarded as the testimony of an enemy.

5th. Apostates, and the first writers against Christianity, and Pagan historians, (such as Julian, Celsus, Trypho, Tacitus, Suetonius, Josephus,) as far as they allude to the subject, admit the facts and variously explain them.

These five arguments, together with the spirit and temper which

the religion infused, and its whole tendencies were stated, illustrated, and enforced, as forming a front which must satisfy the rational and candid, and which the enemies have assailed, and will forever assail in vain.

Sundry exhortations and expostulations, addressed to the Sceptics, finished the discourse, which was most attentively heard to the last word.

Soon as I closed, Mr. *Offen*, in behalf of the Hall of Science, addressed me in the following words, a copy of which was presented to me:—

MR. CAMPBELL,

Sir—The Trustees and Members of the Society of *Moral Philanthropists* (of which I am also a member) have deputed me to present to you their thanks for your friendly visit to Tammany Hall, highly pleased with the splendid talents they have witnessed, connected with erudition the most profound, which has both delighted their ears and conferred dignity to their Hall. The friendly sentiments also you have expressed towards Sceptics—appealing to them as men—as *honest men*, instead of treating them with contumely, as is the conduct of the Christian priesthood of New York. These kind feelings, sir, they duly appreciate, and to them they heartily respond. As it respects some of the evidences of the Christian religion, you have candidly and ably stated them. Should a change take place in our views on that subject, be assured they will be honestly and publicly avowed.

In the event you should again visit New York, you will be to us always a welcome guest. Permit me, sir, to tender to you their best wishes for your health and prosperity; and be pleased to accept the full assurance of their high esteem.

On which I arose in the presence of the audience, and thanked the gentleman, and, through him, the Society which he represented—for the friendly, but too glowing and flattering terms, in which he represented my efforts; lamenting at the same time, that the courtesy of the Sceptics should so far excel that of the religious sects of the city of New York.

On Monday evening we addressed a very large and attentive audience in Mott street, on *the Reign of Heaven and the New Constitution*. I attended a love-feast on Tuesday evening, prepared by the brethren of Lawrence street, at which many of the brethren of all the societies in the city partook with much joy and gladness of heart. After which we delivered an address on *union and co operation*. Several propositions on the subject were offered by the senior brethren of the different societies; and the spirit of love and union seemed to possess every heart. Committees were finally appointed to prepare the way, and we ardently pray that every one who loves the Lord Jesus in that city, will not give rest to his soul while there is a division to heal that can be healed.

On Wednesday evening, the 11th, we heard brother Barker, and followed his address with an exhortation, giving *three reasons* why every sinner in the house should forthwith repent and confess the Lord. Some two or three afterwards gave themselves up to the Lord.

EDITOR.

Naturalization.

THE active mind of this valuable and much esteemed brother, is much devoted to the acquisition of simple and forcible views of the gospel and the Christian religion. He is peculiarly felicitous in the following thoughts, and in the manner of expressing them.

ED. M. H.

JAMES TOWN, Ohio, February 1, 1834.

Dear brother Campbell,

I HAVE observed that as soon as we can get men to understand three things, they go for the reformation:—

1st. That God set up a government on the earth in the days of the Cesars, or in the reign of those kings.

2d. That all the world, Jews and Gentiles, were considered as aliens, and had to be naturalized.

3d. That in the kingdom of God there are two institutions appointed for the remission of sins. The first (*baptism*) for the benefit of aliens. The second (*petition*) for the benefit of subjects. That no Apostle or other inspired teacher, or, to speak after the manner of men, that no officer of God's government ever directed an alien to the latter institution, (petition or prayer,) nor did did they ever direct a subject to the former institution, (baptism;) they uniformly directed aliens (unbaptized persons) to be baptized, and subjects (baptized persons) to petition.

The cases of Simon Magus and Saul of Tarsus are in point. In the case of Simon, he had been baptized in the name of the Lord before Peter and John got to Samaria; but he committed sin afterwards by offering to buy with money the apostolic power, or power of conferring spiritual gifts on others by the laying on of his hands. Peter charged this sin upon him, and directed him to *petition* for its forgiveness. He did not charge Simon's alien sins upon him. He was too well acquainted with the constitution to bring these sins into remembrance again; for the constitution says, "*Their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more.*" Nor did he direct Simon to be baptized for remission of sin committed after his baptism—for this plain reason, that no person could be twice naturalized, or made a subject of the same government a second time.

In the case of Saul of Tarsus—he was a Jew and a Pharisee; he had been earnestly petitioning and fasting (after the manner of Jews) for three days, when Ananias was sent to him to tell him what to do; and he did not tell him to *petition* for the remission of his alien sins, or rebellion. What did he tell him to do? Why he told him to "arise and be baptized, and wash away his sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Saul had been petitioning while an alien, but was commanded to accompany his petition by his naturalization, for all Jews knew that God did not hear sinners, as said he to the Jew that had received sight, who was born blind, "We know that God heareth not sinners."

Much stress is laid on *prayer* by the opposers of reform, as though praying, or the act of praying was more meritorious than any other act; whereas all the human family pray. All that is necessary to induce prayer is, that a man believe in some power superior to his own, or some being superior to himself. He will then invoke the aid of that power or being in which he believes, to assist or enable him to extricate himself from difficulties which he lacks power to overcome; and when extricated, or relieved, he attributes his delivery to the power or being in which he believed, and which he invoked; and whether the difficulty be real or imaginary, he calls on the power in which he believes for aid, and whether the power or being be real or imaginary, still he prays; and many there be who earnestly pray to nonentities, and ascribe wonderful deliverances to wood, and brass, and other inanimate things that have no power.

Prayer is worth just what God has said it is to him that believes what God has said, and does what he has commanded. He has promised favors when asked for. He, then, that prays to God in faith for any thing he has promised, may expect to receive what he asks for, through the means that God has appointed to bestow such favors. But none can pray to God in faith for a thing that he has not promised to bestow; nor can any pray in faith that any favor promised be bestowed through any other medium than the one appointed by God. Those who ask favors of God according to the directions given by Jesus Christ, have promises. Those who ask favors of God according to the directions given by Mahomet, have no promises. He bestows all his favors through his Son Jesus Christ.

M. WINANS.

Hints on Mr. Hinton's Association Sermon:

OR,

HINTON'S THEORY OF CONVERSION.

IT would seem as if the public mind is never to be disabused of the mystic theology of the dark ages. As soon as one of the wounded warriors of the church militant retires from the field, another brandishes his arms, and exclaims, "To your tents, O Israel!" But, perhaps, this mystic Apostle of gospelized stoicism, like other wild beasts, struggles most when dying. One thing is, however, evident—that new and more vigorous efforts are being made to sustain the fatal dogma that the Bible is of no salutary use to the world; that all its supernatural credentials are nonsense, and of no saving utility; that the Oracle of the Almighty is a dead letter until the Spirit of God works a mystic faith into the soul of the reader or hearer. How long will men, professing veneration for the Bible, not only seek to be wise above what is written, but wise in opposition to what is written!

A certain Mr. Hinton, who has displaced Elder John Kerr in Richmond, and who is struggling hard to be the Magnus Apollo of the

Dover Association, at the expense of the popularity of my much esteemed friend Andrew Broaddus, in a sermon appended to the minutes of the last meeting of that Association as a substitute for a circular letter, has, in a very labored effort, undertaken to sustain a somewhat new version of the theory that no man can believe God, though he may believe man who is *less credible*, unless something called faith, in the isoretic sense, is worked into the soul by the Holy Spirit, while the man too is in the very act of resisting the authority and veracity of God. Any other view of the matter of conversion, except that which represents the Spirit of God as entering forcibly into the heart of a wicked man, and disposing him to lay down his arms of rebellion by some non-descript physical operation, mystically mysterious, is politely, and in a most approved Christian spirit, represented as "blaspheming against the Holy Ghost;" and he who holds it is a fool, a madman, and has well nigh sinned in a way which has no forgiveness, either in the present or future state. So excessively charitable, modest, and unassuming is our preacher; that he, with all pontifical dignity, denounces our views as "soul damning error." O Shame, where is thy blush!

What this preacher of mysticism lacks in argument he makes up in denunciation. If weak in knowledge and in faith, he is strong in assertion and powerful in condemnatory declamation. But we shall bring him to the test, and weigh his productions in the balances of the sanctuary.

After embellishing the exordium of his sermon with the marrow bones of a discourse delivered in his presence by our beloved brother David S. Burnet, on the operations of the Holy Spirit on matter, intellect, and disposition, in the gift of tongues, and in inspiring the Apostles and Prophets with the knowledge of the truth—all of which is very good, save some few additions of his own; he proceeds to the newly vamped theory of St. Austin, in the words following, to wit:—

"The work of the Spirit, we maintain to be *a suasive influence operating upon the human mind according to the laws of its intelligent constitution.*" This is the theory of the *nature* of the converting operation of the Spirit in producing faith and repentance which Mr. Hinton maintains. Faith and repentance are with him the effect of "the *personal persuasion* of the Holy Spirit." This is what he affirms under that item of his discourse which shows what the nature of this operation is not, and what it is. Needs he not a few definitions here! What is a "*suasive influence*"? What a suasive influence *operating*? What are the *acknowledged laws* of the constitution of the mind? And what the acknowledged laws of its *intelligent* constitution? In this mist of words, like the shades of Homer, the phantom vanishes from our sight. It is true he makes a feint at defining a *suasive* influence; but he found it safest to tell us what it is *not*, than what it is. It is not "*a moral suasion.*" Very kind, Mr. Hinton. When your son asks you what means an *appricot*, you tell him, 'My son, it is not an *apron*.' Will he not become a very learned gentleman under your tuition?—! But it is not *moral* suasion? Do you mean

that it is *immoral* suasion? And what are *suasion* and *suasive?* Obsolete terms they are indeed. Once they were current as the *change* for *per*, and *suasion;* but now, as Mr. Walker informs us, *suasive* is uncurrent among the learned. It is, perhaps, *persuasive* you would say, were it not that you feared detection; for *persuasion* always implies not force, but moral argument—*motive.* Now if the Spirit of God produces faith by motive, there must be something believed before motive can be found; therefore, the use you have for the Spirit in your theory is to work faith in a believer! There can be neither moral argument, nor motive, nor persuasion, (Philosophy and the Dictionary being witnesses,) without some fact, promise, or threatening before the mind; and if the fact, the promise, or the threatening be not believed, they have no more power on the mind than a shadow has to kill a giant. When I see the oaks of Bashan falling because the shadow of a passing cloud has stricken them, then will I assent to the power of a motive, argument, or persuasion that is not known or believed.

Mr. Hinton seems to have great learning—even more than in our common Dictionaries, or in the Dictionary of all the Arts and Sciences; for he says, a spirit dwelling in a mortal body can influence another spirit, without motive, argument, word, or letter, just by the "*pathology of countenance*"! Dont laugh, learned reader. It is a fact that Mr. Hinton has studied the *pathology* of language, of attitude, of countenance, of tone, of a glance of the eye—nay, the pathology of pathology itself, till he can tell all diseases by a glance; and so deep his lore in metaphysical pathology, that, in the words of Hudibras—

> "*He is in logic a great critic,*
> *Profoundly skill'd in analytic;*
> *He can distinguish and divide*
> *A hair, 'twixt* south *and* south-west *side!*"

Now the argument to prove the nature of the *force* applied in producing faith, drawn from this pathological science, is, that the Spirit, without word, letter, argument, or motive, of a moral kind found in the Bible, does, by a look, an attitude, a tone, or the symptom of a look, an attitude, or a tone, or some other indescribable pathologic power of expression, force repentance and faith into the mind of an infidel.

Now, gentle reader, if such be the tact of this theologian on the suasive influence part of his theory, with what dexterity, think you, will he pass through the ordeal on the other branches of his creed; such as the acknowledged laws of the *intelligent* constitution of the mind of an unbeliever. He has not as yet told us one of the laws which are acknowledged, or of those which are not acknowledged; nor laid down a single proposition on the intelligent constitution, nor on the unintelligent constitution of the mind; prudently leaving all the back doors open in favor of an easy escape from conviction and capture.

So well skilled is he in definition, that he delights in distinctions for the sake of distinguishing himself. He says elsewhere in this ser-

mon, that it is a *fact* that Jesus died; but not a fact that he *died for sinners:* that he *died for sinners* is a *doctrine;* but that he *died* is not a *doctrine*, but a *fact.*

We wish our readers to appreciate what sort of a rhetorician, grammarian, and critic, as well as theologian, we have to contend with in the person of Mr. Hinton on regeneration.

A word or two now on his theology, reserving something for another day; for this is too good a lesson not to learn something from it. ——He adduces *seven* arguments to prove that a special miracle is wrought in every case of true faith and repentance. In other words, no man can believe to the saving of his soul, unless the Holy Spirit specially and effectually call him by some *suasive influence*, which is not to be effected by any second causes whatever. That in every case faith in the human heart is as great a miracle, and as strong an evidence of the work of the Holy Spirit, as is the resurrection of Lazarus or the translation of Elijah. "It is," he says, "a soul-damning error" to teach that any one can believe to salvation upon all the miracles recorded, or all the prophecies uttered, or all that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit have ever said, or done, in all the Prophets and Apostles, on earth or in heaven, in time or in eternity. But it is a "soul-saving truth" to teach that God cannot, by any second cause, work faith in the heart of a sinner; that, notwithstanding all the works of Jesus, of the Holy Spirit, and all the labors of apostles, saints, martyrs, and preachers, saving faith is impossible to every son of Adam. This is his soul-reviving and soul-saving gospel! The sinner cannot pray without faith, cannot come to God without faith, cannot obtain faith by any help in the universe, by no second cause, help or helper; but the Spirit, by a special influence, must do all the work, lest any man should boast! This is the gospel of St. Austin, improved and amended by Mr. Hinton, and newly dressed up in *suasive influence*, operating according to the acknowledged laws of the *intelligent constitution* of the human mind.

Among the *seven* arguments [sacred number!] there is one, and only one which is to the point, and that is the 4th, which says, "The fundamental truth we are maintaining *rests upon the express assertions of the Divine Oracles.*" If this were true, it would be enough for me; and he might keep the other *six* for those on whose minds the express assertions of the Divine Oracles are not sufficient. But, unfortunately for Mr. Hinton, he cannot produce *one express sentence*, from Genesis to the Apocalypse, which asserts that the Spirit of God works faith and repentance in the minds of sinners by entering into their hearts or infusing any grace, special or effectual, that is not found in the written testimony of God.

The Lord opened Lydia's heart. A worshipper of God she had been before she heard Paul. But the Lord opens the ears, the eyes, and the hearts of men by a thousand means. This text does not say that the Lord opened the heart of Lydia by the Holy Spirit entering into it, or by Mr. Hinton's *suasive pathological influence.*

"God gave the increase"—"The Lord gave to every man"—"Faith is the gift of God"—"Who made thee to differ?" These are his express proofs. Now we quote all these verses with the utmost pleasure, to show that our salvation is of God from Alpha to Omega. But Mr. Hinton will have God bound down and obliged to do all this in one arbitrary way by his Spirit; and we contend that he has all means, natural and moral, in the universe, in requisition, to accomplish all his ends, moral and physical.

The word is not *The Lord opened Lydia's heart by the Holy Spirit;* nor does it read, *The Lord by his Holy Spirit gave to Paul;* or made men to differ from one another!

Mr. Hinton is all the while begging the question. I say, the bread which I eat, the water which I drink, and the apparel which I wear, are all the gifts of God. It is the Lord made me to differ from Mr. Hinton, and it is the Lord who worketh all in all. That is not the question concerning which we differ; but *how* the Lord makes men to differ—*how* he opened Lydia's heart—*how* he gives to every man. But we shall, all things concurring, lay still farther open the sophistry and delusion by which this gentleman imposes on himself and his readers. EDITOR.

Address to the Brethren of the Reformation.

NO. I.

Beloved brethren in the Lord: Favor, mercy, and peace from God our Father, and from Jesus Christ our Lord, be multiplied to you!

THERE are three things to which we most affectionately and devoutly invite the attention of all our brethren in the kingdom of the Messiah. These are, the religious training of their families—the order, worship, and discipline of the congregation—and the conversion of the world. What do you more than others, brethren, in these three great objects of Christian care and enterprize? We honor the Bible as sufficient not only to make us wise to salvation, but as divinely adapted to accomplish the man of God for every good word and work. Do we use it thus in our daily practice, and in the education of our families? Do we teach it to our children and those under our care, as we teach them the learning, the science, and business of this world; or do we rather devote our thoughts and our efforts as if we valued the acquisitions of *this* life as the pearl of great value, and the things of the life *to come* as of inferior importance? Are our families nurseries for Christ and heaven, or are they schools for training our children to live according to the flesh, according to the course of this deceitful world, the fashion of which passes away? These are questions which the word of God and conscience constrain every head of a family to propose to himself.

Again, are the congregations walking in the admonition and consolations of the Apostles' teaching? Do they continue steadfast in the

teaching, in the breaking of the loaf, in the fellowship, and prayers of the Apostles? Do the brethren meet regularly, timously, and zealously on every first day, as health and opportunity permit; or are they content to appear in the Lord's house once-a-month, as convenience and inclination may prompt? Do they meet rather for the sake of hearing a preacher of some note, or for commemorating the Lord's death and resurrection, and keeping his holy institutions? Do they tenderly and affectionately cultivate all brotherly kindness and love, and admonish one another by their example to take heed lest there be in any one of them an evil heart of unbelief in departing from the living God? If any brother seems to grow cold and remiss in waiting upon the assemblies of the brethren, do the brotherhood inquire after him as an absent member of a family? Do they in all tenderness and affectionate regard, endeavor to stir him up to his duty? Or do they, in a censorious spirit, first arraign him as an evil doer, and propose to him exclusion, unless he forthwith render satisfaction? Is the discipline of the congregation at one time so exact that scarce a Christian can continue in it without censure; and at another time so lax that scarce a defaulter or an evil doer can be excluded? Is every thing done decently and in order, that no stumbling block is thrown in the way of saint or sinner? Are the congregations walking in the Holy Scriptures, growing in knowledge, and in favor with God and all the people?

Again, what is doing for the conversion of the world? Are you brethren, to whom the Lord and your brethren have given ability and opportunity to win souls, ardently and perseveringly engaged in this work, gathering fruit to eternal life? Are you enduring hardships as good soldiers of Jesus Christ, and laboring in season and out of season in proclaiming the word; or are you seeking your own things only or chiefly, and not the things of Jesus Christ? Do you complain of the brethren that they will not sustain you while you labor for the Lord and for an eternal crown; and cannot you trust in the Lord and look to him for reward? or do you think that because the brethren do not do their duty, that you will help the matter by not doing yours? Will two wrongs make one right? And you, brethren, of whom they complain, do you think that it is the duty of only one or two citizens in the kingdom to leave their wives, and children, and farms, and labor for the Lord; and yours to wait upon your wives, and children, and farms, without spending one day's labor, or the value of it, in a month, for the conversion of those who are living and dying in their sins? Has the Lord said that one in fifty shall labor all the year for him, and the forty-nine shall labor for themselves? Has he thus called and honored one per cent. or two per cent. of his citizens, and doomed the remainder to toil for their own appetites and passions, and leave their treasure in the earth? Has the Bank of Heaven decreed that no deposites shall be made in it but by one or two in every hundred who have the gift of giving out the knowledge of salvation; and that he that speaks shall receive a hundred fold, and he that gives labor, or sustenance, or money (their representative,) shall never draw either principle or interest from the treasury of God?

Such questions as these, dear brethren, when reflected on for a month, will prepare you to expect what ought to be said and done on these three topics of such cardinal concern to you, to me, to the world, and to Jesus Christ our Saviour—to whom be everlasting honor.

EDITOR.

The Fall of Jerusalem.

THE fall of our illustrious and happy city was supernatural. The destruction of the conquered was against the first principles of the Roman policy; and to the last hour of our national existence, Rome held out offers of peace, and lamented our frantic disposition to be undone. But the decree was gone forth from a mightier throne. During the latter days of the siege, a hostility to which that of a man was as a grain of sand to the tempest that drives it on, overpowered our strength and senses. Fearful shapes and voices in the air—visions starting us from our short and troublesome sleep—lunacy in its hideous forms—sudden death in the midst of vigor—the fury of the elements let loose upon our heads. We had every terror and evil that could beset human nature, but pestilence, the most probable of all, in a city crowded with the famishing, the diseased, the wounded, and the dead. Yet though the streets were covered with unburied, though every well and trench was teeming, though six hundred thousand corpses lay flung over the ramparts, and lay naked to the sun, pestilence came not—for if it had come, the enemy would have been scared away. But "the abomination of desolation," the Pagan standard, was fixed where it was to remain until the plough had passed over the ruins of Jerusalem.

On this fatal night no man laid his head upon the pillow. Heaven and earth were in conflict. Meteors burned over us—the ground shook under our feet—the volcanoes blazed—the wind burst forth in irresistible blasts, and swept the living and the dead in whirlwinds far into the desert. We heard the bellowing of the distant Mediterranean, as if its waters were at our sides, swelled by the deluge. The lakes and rivers roared and inundated the land. The fiery sword shot out tenfold fire—showers of blood fell—thunder pealed from every quarter of the heavens—lightning, in immense sheets, of an intensity and duration that turned the darkness into more than day, withering eye and soul, burned from the zenith to the ground, and marked its track by forests of flame, and shattered the summits of the hills. Defence was unthought of, for the mortal enemy had passed from the mind. Our hearts quaked for fear; but it was to see the powers of heaven shaken. All cast away the shield and spear, and crouched before the descending judgment.

We were conscience-smitten. Our cries of remorse, anguish, and horror were heard through the uproar of the storm. We howled to caverns to hide us. We plunged into the sepulchres to escape the wrath that consumed the living. We would have buried ourselves under the mountains. I knew the cause—the unspeakable cause, and knew that the last hour of crime was at hand. A few fugitives, astonished to see one man amongst them not sunk into the lowest feebleness of fear, came around me, and besought me to lead them to some place of safety, if such were now to be found on earth. I told them openly that they were to die, and counselled them to die in the hallowed ground of the Temple. They followed; and I led through streets encumbered with every shape of human sufferings, to the foot of Mount Moriah; but beyond that, we found advance impossible. Piles of clouds, whose darkness was palpable even in the midnight in which we stood, covered the holy hill. Impatient, and not to be daunted by any thing that man could overcome, I cheered my disheartened band, and attempted to lead the way up the ascents; but I had scarcely entered the cloud when I was swept down by a gust that tore the rocks in a flinty shower around me.

Now came the last and most wonderful sign that marked the fate of rejected Israel. While I lay helpless, I heard the whirlwind roar through the cloudy hill, and vapors began to revolve. A pale light, like that of the rising moon, quivered on the edges of the horizon, and the clouds rose rapidly, shaping themselves into the forms of battlements and towers. The sound of voices was heard within, low and distinct, yet strangely sweet. Still the lustre brightened, and the airy building rose, tower on tower, and battlement on battlement, in awe that held us mute. We knelt and gazed on this more than mortal architecture, that continued rising and spreading, and glowing with a serener light, still soft and silvery, yet to which the broadest moonlight was dim. At last, it stood forth to earth and heaven, the colossal image of the first temple—of the building raised by the wisest of men, and consecrated by the visible glory.

All Jerusalem saw the image, and the shout that in the midst of their despair ascended from the thousands and tens of thousands, told what proud remembrances were there. But a hymn was heard that might have hushed the world besides. Never fell on my ears, never on the human sense, a sound so majestic, yet so subduing—so full of melancholy, yet of grandeur and command. The vast portal opened, and from it marched a host, such as man had never seen before, such as man shall never see but once again—the guardian angels of the city of David. They came forth gloriously, but woe in all their steps—the stars upon their helmets dim—their robes stained—tears flowing down their celestial beauty. "*Let us go hence*" was their song of sorrow. "*Let us go hence,*" was answered by sad echoes of the mountains. "*Let us go hence,*" swelled upon the night to the furthermost limits of the land.

The procession lingered long upon the summit of the hill. The thunders pealed, and they rose at the command, diffusing waves of light over the expanse of heaven. The chorus was heard, still magnificent and melancholy, when their splendor was diminished to the brightness of a star. Then the thunder roared again—the cloudy Temple was scattered on the wind—and darkness, the omen of the grave, settled upon Jerusalem.

[*Croly's Salathiel.*]

The Hygeian System.

IN this age of theory and experiment in all departments of society—in politics, mechanics, agriculture, law, physic, and theology, nothing seems destined to stand, that can be shaken. In the theory and practice of medicine, as in every thing else, all things are afloat. One school cures every thing by calomel and the lancet—another, by steaming and sweating—a third, by purging in a long list of cathartics—a fourth, in imitation of Doctor Nature, sometimes bleed, sometimes sweat, sometimes purge, as the patient may seem to require—

Non nostrum inter vos tantas componere lites.

Who can decide when Doctors disagree? But as our maxim has been, "Bring all things to the test, and hold fast that which is good," we have tried in our own household and amongst our friends and neighbors, with great pleasure and success, the Hygeian system, sometimes called "Morrisoniana,' or "the Morrison Pills." Such have been our experience and observation of the innocence, mildness, and efficacy of this composition, that, from the most disinterested principles of benevolence, we must recommend them to the afflicted

who have tried many things in vain. So many obdurate diseases of the stomach and bowels and of the whole system have been relieved, or perfectly cured by them, that they are worthy of trial, especially in all those cases in which other remedies have failed. Being a vegetable composition, they are perfectly *innocent*, which is saying a great deal in this guilty age; and being a very happy combination, they can injure no constitution when used according to the printed directions. *Thomas Brindley*, No. 63, Chesnut street, Philadelphia, is General Agent for Pennsylvania.

EDITOR.

Disorganizers and Demoralizers.

IT is known to the world, as far as the Dover Association can send it to Asia, Africa, Europe, and America, that certain ministers and elders of churches are characterized as disorganizers and demoralizers. Six ministers, of the first standing in religious society, and in the whole bounds of their acquaintance, are thus sacrificed on the altar of the demon of discord—at the shrine of sectarian animosity; and yet, though the Association is publicly convicted at the bar of public opinion, by all the umpires in society, of this outrage upon the moral character of these distinguished men, they have not repented of this grievous sin against heaven and earth; but still hold them up to public infamy as far as there is faith in their proceedings.

This most unchristian conduct, practised under the pretence of orthodoxy, requires us, on the principles of justice, to publish the following document; which, though of rather too private and local a character, reflects a little light upon the spirit that works in the hearts of all the children of opposition to reformation:—

EDITOR.

October 6th, 1833.

THIS day the white male members of James City Baptist Church, after having been duly notified to attend a church Meeting at the Quaker Meeting House, did accordingly attend the said meeting, with the exception of four members, who were unable to do so in consequence of sickness. Whereupon, Richard E. Taylor being chosen *Moderator*, and Henry B. M. Richardson *Clerk*, the members proceeded to act in relation to the church letter which was sent to the last Dover Association, held in Williamsburg on the 24th of September last. It appearing from the proceedings of the members of that Association that the odium of forgery was cast upon brother John Ratcliffe, who was one of the delegates to that Association, and who, being the Clerk of our church, was appointed to write the abovementioned letter according to the instructions of our church. [See the said letter, entered on record in the church book, a true copy of which is hereunto subjoined.] Whereupon, on motion of G. B. Lightfoot, in order to ascertain whether the above letter was written agreeably to the instructions of the church, and whether the least degree of censure could be cast on the Clerk for writing said letter in the manner and form that it was written—the vote was taken, and without a dissenting voice the members unanimously declared that the above letter was written according to the instructions of the church—that it was the church letter—and that therefore our delegate could not, in the slightest degree, be charged with forgery, or improper conduct in relation thereto.

In consequence of the proceedings of the last Dover Association in relation to this church, on motion of George B. Lightfoot, "that the church do now withdraw from the Association," the following members did accordingly withdraw, *to wit*:—George Wills, Richard E. Taylor, George Gotey, William Bailey, John Ratcliffe, Thomas Boswell, Edward R. Coke, Allen Richardson, Royal Piggott, William R. Jordan, John B. Mahone, George B. Lightfoot, Henry B. M. Richardson, and William R. Richardson; and we do therefore consider ourselves no longer under the power and dominion of any man or set of men, owning allegiance to the King of Kings and Lord of Lords only, and being desirous (God helping) to order our course according to the Holy Scriptures, which will make wise to salvation all who believe and act in conformity therewith. The other six members, viz. William Otey, William P. Browne, John E. Browne, Thomas Austin, William Cardwell, and Thomas James, thought proper to remain in the Association.

The fourteen members who withdrew from the Association, as above mentioned, then proceeded to elect their officers; whereupon Richard E. Taylor, Thomas Boswell, and William R. Richardson were nominated and elected *Deacons;* and Henry B. M. Richardson nominated and elected *Clerk.*

The church then voted that the above proceedings be printed and published.

By order of the Church,

HENRY B. M. RICHARDSON, *Clerk.*

COPY OF THE CHURCH LETTER.

James City Church, to the Dover Association, to be held at Zion's Church, in the city of Williamsburg, on the 24th inst. sendeth Christian salutations.

Dear brethren—We thank our heavenly Father that his providential care has been over us through the changing scenes of another year, and that we are once more permitted to correspond with you by letter and delegates. Though we have nothing very remarkable to state, we can say, that an unusual degree of love and union exist among us, having gotten over the discord and prejudice which were caused by the proceedings of the last Association. We have chosen brethren Robert Morris, William M. Jones, and John Ratcliffe to sit with you in your deliberations, whom we unanimously instruct to use all the influence of which they are capable of using, to rescind those resolutions passed the last Association in relation to the exclusion of brethren Ainslie, Du Val, Richards, Webber, Henley, and Atkinson, the most of whom we are personally acquainted with, and whom we hold near and dear to us, and have often heard them preach, and do not believe *that they teach doctrines either demoralizing or disorganizing;* and therefore we pray that you may reconsider the matter. And they are also instructed to cause you, if possible, to revoke the resolution which says, "that the Association cannot consistently and conscientiously receive them, nor any other minister maintaining their views, as members of their body; nor can in future act in concert with delegates from any church or churches that may encourage or countenance their ministrations." Brethren, we do not think that difference of opinion should be a bar to fellowship; and as to the ministrations of the above named brethren, we trust we shall never in the slightest degree discourage or discountenance, so long as they teach what we have heard from them. We will now come to a close by giving the number, &c.———

May the Lord be with you and direct you by his word in the path of truth unto the end.

Sigued by order of the Church,

JOHN RATCLIFFE, *Clerk.*

From the Religious Narrator.

The professed Restorers of the Ancient Gospel.

THERE are amongst us those who confidently affirm that all sects of Christians except themselves, are radically wrong in their views and practices in relation to the gospel of Christ; that the order of the Christian church as established by the Apostles is nearly, if not wholly abolished from all modern churches, with the exception of their own *Christian Congregation;* that they only have the *true, ancient, primitive, gospel order;* and that this order consists mainly in *baptism for the remission of sins,* belief according to the understanding of every individual in the dogmas of the Apostles, the weekly breaking of the "*loaf of blessing,*" and a license to every one who chooses, to administer baptism and the Lord's supper. They deny any *regeneration* other than baptism, generally adopt a new version of the New Testament, and make very little use of the Old Testament. Being a very confident, assuming, and self-sufficient people, they boldly and clamorously condemn the opinions of all those who maintain the necessity of the Spirit's influence in regeneration, and who decline the observance of their pretended *apostolic order.* To make Christians according to their views, it is only requisite to convince the reason of men, of the truth of the Christian religion, and then regenerate them by immersion in water. Many of the Baptist churches in Virginia, Kentucky, and Ohio, have been infested and distracted with the spirit of innovation, attendant upon the efforts of these professed restorers of the "*ancient gospel.*" Latterly an attempt has been made to enlighten Philadelphia on its claims and pretensions, and those Baptists who have put themselves in the way of the illumination, have been gravely informed that they are wholly in error, that they are gulled and cheated by their designing and mercenary pastors, who perpetuate the deception only that they may continue to enjoy their salaries, and make a gain of the *Lord's congregations.* At the same time, we do not learn that these *professed restorers* ever refuse money when offered to them; or that they decline making *a fair profit* on all the pains which they take to utter, publish, announce, and print their sentiments and opinions. They wipe their feet upon our carpets, alleging that they tread upon *our* pride, whilst they persuade themselves that *their* pride and insolence in doing this act escape detection. But in this they err. There is good sense enough in most communities to see through such flimsy pretences.

These *restorers* will no doubt have infused a bad leaven into some of our churches, and will thus enjoy the bad gratification of having created confusion among us. In our mind, the sooner each and every church expels from its bosom such leaven, the better. The Regular Baptists in Virginia have found it requisite to draw a line between themselves and these pseudo-restoers. Their doctrine eats as a canker, and must be suppressed and exterminated in each body, by that power with which Christ has clothed his church, and that is the power of censure and expulsion.

MR. BRANTLY A *RELIGIOUS*, RATHER THAN A *TRUE* NARRATOR.

ONE can hardly conceive of a grosser perversion, a more unwarranted representation of our views and religious practices, in so small a compass, than is written by Mr. Brantly, the RELIGIOUS *Narrator* for Philadelphia. Let me fall into the hands of *truth-telling*, rather than *religious* narrators—if this be a fair specimen!

Whether it be that the number *seven* is that number in which the perfection of falsehood as well as of truth delights, I presume not to decide; but one thing I fearlessly affirm, that the *Religious* Narrator

has in the above narrative, besides many deceptious hints, recorded seven palpable falsehoods. 1. With us, he says, gospel order consists mainly in baptism for remission of sins. 2. In belief according to every one's understanding of the Apostles' dogmas. 3. In granting a licence to every one who chooses to administer baptism and the Lord's supper. 4. They teach no regeneration other than baptism. 5. They make very little use of the Old Testament. 6. To make a Christian is, with them, to convince the reason of a man that the Christian religion is true. 7. They regenerate men by immersion in water. In the fair import of these words, and in the application of them by Mr. Brantly, seven downright and upright falsehoods are religiously asserted. To have charged myself with poligamy, gambling, or intemperance, would not be a greater outrage on truth and fact, than is the preceding narrative in those instances, and in others yet to be noticed.

Mr. Brantly knows better, and could have known my sentiments still better than he does; for I threw myself in his way more than once during my stay in Philadelphia; but he kept out of my way, I *believe*, studiously, even to the desertion of his own appointment, rather than to let me have an opportunity of hearing or seeing him. I say he knows better than to think that he does not falsify and misrepresent my views and practice. And as farther illustrative and confirmatory of this affirmation, will the reader reflect upon the following coarse and palpable inuendo:—

"We do not learn," says he, "that these professed restorers ever refuse money when offered to them" for preaching. This is, from its connexion, obviously alleged against myself; and, when fairly construed, imports that Mr. Brantly had learned that although we profess to labor for the Lord and for men in the word and teaching, without money or price, we treacherously accept wages from men.

'We do not learn,' say we, 'that Mr. Brantly is very honest in paying his debts.' Mr. Brantly exclaims, 'What, sir, do you mean? Why criminate me thus? Tell me not, sir, what you do *not* learn, but what you *do* learn!'

Nomine mutato fabula narratur de te.

"When offered, money is accepted," narrates Mr. Brantly. This is in keeping with the above *seven*, only a little more flagitious!

The *expences of my tour* were, indeed, offered me by the brethren in New York. I thanked them through the brother who tendered to me their donation, observing that I thought it quite reasonable and just that they should have made me such a tender—that I approved of such contributions in favor of those who labor and toil for the salvation of men—that I hoped they would not forget such good works when opportunity served; but that he and the brethren would please permit me to refuse their kindness; for that I had resolved to serve the Lord at my own expense so long as I lived, and so far as opportunity was afforded me; and that I would not at that time depart from a course which I had pursued for so many years. Mr. Brantly

may now make a jest of my disclosure of what was done in secret, after having constrained me!

We censure no person for receiving money for his labors, either as preacher or teacher, when he needs it, or when the brethren offer it; but for ourselves we claim the right to refuse. We believe that it "is happier to give than to receive." But this is a fatal error, a dangerous heresy, in Mr. Brantly's *religious* faith.

As to our publications we sell them as other property is sold, at a fair value, and endeavor to *pay our own debts*, and for the surplus, *if surplus we receive*, we hold it subject to the calls of the Lord's cause and people. Before we published a word on the subject of religion, we labored and journeyed at our own expense for several years without receiving any earthly reward. We tried to be just in doing so, and the Lord has in consequence enabled us to do what none of Mr. Brantly's class of salary Doctors could or dare attempt. We can appear in defence of Christianity where Mr. Brantly dare not show his face, from conscious vulnerability.

But, says Mr. B. "They wipe their feet on our carpets," &c. I do not know the color of Mr. B's carpets and never soiled them. I do not know how fine they are; but I doubt not they are very fine and unsullied with the dust off the feet of heresy. Gentlemen of Mr. Brantly's birth and good fortune generally stand on Brussels and know how to keep them clean. I am afraid, however, that those who walk on Mr. Brantly's Turkey and Brussels do not walk on more than half his pride. We are I hope better philosophers than to suppose when we stand upon such fine carpets as Mr. B. delights to see, that we have got more than our toe upon the heel of his pride.

But the "bad leaven" is likely to work a little in the environs of the Doctor, and this has infused into him a bad spirit. But with all his boldness and zeal, methinks the ballot box, or the votes of the majority, will do more to purify the church than all his own logic and divinity. In this I think he reasons prudently—for so much was he afraid of this heresy, this bad leaven, that I found his pulpit deserted and his flock left to the wolf when I made my appearance in a church which he ought from his covenant to have defended from my heresy.

One thing Mr. Brantly seems to understand full well, that it is safest to keep out of the way of trial. He, therefore, waited till I had left Philadelphia before he opened his battery. Indeed, he shows that self-preservation is one of the laws of human nature, which he perfectly understands. That he is conscious of his own imbecility we need no other proof than he has given us. He knows that if I had opened the old apostolic heresy of Paul and Peter in his church in half a dozen of discourses, he might stand on his Brussels for twelve months and fail to purify his church from the leaven any other way than by censure and expulsion. By these weapons, and by these only, can he successfully wage war against reformation, or the apostolic heresy.

EDITOR.

Progress of Reform.

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

CARLOWSVILLE, Dallas county, Ala. January 3, 1834.

THE cause of God, like a swift flowing stream, is hurrying along to cover the earth. Opposition to the ancient gospel is as oil to the flame. There is already a great noise in this part of God's vineyard. A mighty shaking in the valley of clerical dry bones. O Lord, blow thy breath (the ancient gospel) upon this valley, until bone shall come to its bone, and form "one body."

Notwithstanding the influence which *priestcraft* has exercised over this newly settled section, there are some mental "orbs" which are receiving and emitting those salutiferous rays which are so essential to the good health of Zion. In Lowndes county, Ala. a brother Mothershead writes, August 3d, 1833, brothers Stone and Johnson, "There have been something like one hundred members added since last Christmas in these parts, taking brother Andison's labors and mine together. In short, I can say that truth is making rapid strides." Brother Andison, who is evangelizing in Butler, Montgomery, and part of Lowndes county, reports highly favorable. Also, a brother Ambrose Lea, Springfield, Green county, Ala. writes to the *Christian Messenger*, that there are nine of those apostates here who have apostatized from creeds, the invention of silly men, who cannot join any of the sects, (2 Thess. ii.) and prays that some proclaimer, of pure speech, may come over and help them. God bless brother Lea and his faithful little group!

Brother C. you once said in Lexington, Ky. that "it was not reasonable for one to shed tears upon hearing good news." Old brother John Taylor is my informant. But be that as it may, my eyes do overflow. O my soul! little did I think when I consented to launch my bark upon the angry waves, to arrive in sight of so many vessels, in so short time, bound for the same heavenly port, and aided by the same compass and beacon.

We have formed a little congregation here upon the New Testament—Heaven's Magna Charta. We were aided by the labors of a brother Young, from Kentucky, who is, as a proclaimer of the ancient gospel, a host in himself. We thank God for the Christian services of brother Young. Clouds of opposition here are rarefying. The people here have just discovered that those among us who would be ambassadors for God, lack every thing necessary to the formation of that character—1st. To see Jesus face to face. 2d. To possess power to work miracles, such as to convert water into wine, &c. 3d. That their words are divine, and must be printed in a book denominated the New Testament. And again—Before a man becomes a bishop, &c. he must be "apt to teach," &c. not receive induction merely because he informs the congregation *he* feels like ———, or some other unmeaning and unscriptural declaration. And further, the people are convinced that, in primitive days, elders, overseers, bishops, or teachers were ordained in every church or congregation—that is, a plurality of instructors, in each church—not one bishop over a plurality of congregations; and he, too, frequently, a catechumen. Babylon the Lesser is falling. Hasten its overthrow, O Lord! There are also some who think that faith and obedience are equal, if not superior, to an orthodox faith, unconnected. John xvii. 20, 21.

J. A. BUTLER.

KINGSVILLE, January 21, 1834.

OUR beloved brother (your father) made us a visit about four years ago, at which time eleven disciples united together, making the New Testament their rule of faith and practice, and made choice of brother Porter to preside; yet notwithstanding much opposition, our number has increased to upwards of seventy, and the prospect fair for more increase. Brother A. Saunders, from

Beaver, Pa. has met with us once-a-month the year past, and many have been added to the congregation of the Lord by his labors, and numbers more are standing on the bank of Jordan, looking across to the promised land, acting with wisdom, like the Bereans, searching the Scriptures daily to see if these things be so. The three popular sects in this town and the township adjoining have united their efforts to stay the progress of reformation, but have failed in their attempts. Our assemblies are large and attentive generally, with the exception of now and then one who cries out, "*C———m!*"

Brother Porter has gone on his contemplated tour to the state of Connecticut. He has been absent about two months. We have not heard from him the particulars of his visit, but do anticipate hearing from him soon of the spread of the gospel in that state; and thus while they are in the "land of steady habits" sending their missionaries to us poor heathens in this Western Country, we, in return, are endeavoring to send the gospel to them who we believe are teaching for doctrine the commandments of men.

T. G. FRISBIE.

VERNON, Ind. January 22, 1834.

THE church in this place was built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, on the first Saturday in November, 1831, of thirteen members; and being surrounded by the united opposition of Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians, we girded on the gospel armor as well as we could in order to combat it. Our number was but eighteen until the first Friday in October last, when we held a seven days' meeting. Brethren John O'Kane, Joseph Fassett, Chauncy Butler, and Jesse Maurity were with us, at which time forty-five were added to the church, thirty-five by immersion, the others having been before immersed. I have immersed six since. Our number is sixty-nine.

J. B. NEW.

QUERY.

QUERY 1.—Ought the loaf used in the Supper to be presented on the table whole and unbroken?

Answer.—So I am taught by Paul, and so I would infer from that fitness and propriety of things which appear in every branch of the Christian economy. Paul argues from the unity of the loaf to the unity of the church, or affirms the unity of the church from the unity of the loaf, 1 Cor. x. 17. "Because there is one loaf, we, the many, are one body; for we all participate of that one loaf." If a loaf is put upon the table, cut or broken, as is the custom in most of the religious sects, the primary idea in the supper is not represented by the partakers. There is no representation of *the breaking of the body* of Jesus. There may be a representation of communion on the *broken body;* but no symbol of the sacrifice of Christ—no commemoration of the breaking of his body. "The loaf," says Paul, "*which we break*, is it not the joint participation of the body of Christ?" There can be no exhibition of the breaking of the body of Jesus, if the loaf is broken before the disciples assemble around the Lord's table.

EDITOR.

☞Letters from Henry Grew and Thomas M. Henley in our next.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Number III.——Volume V.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Bethany, Va. March, 1834.

Signs of the Times.

[CONTINUED.]

THE final judgment is alluded to, but in few places in holy writ. See Cor. xv. 1 Thess. iv. Rev. xx. "And I saw a great white throne," &c.

But to our subject; see Heb. ix. 28. "And unto them that look for him shall he appear without sin unto salvation." The passage is rendered more plain in some translations: "Without sin offering in order to salvation." But the coming is that to which we solicit inquiry. In the text there is a fair promise to those who look for him. Now, are not those excluded by the promise who look not for his coming? Can any one be in a state of readiness, while believing this event is never to take place? The servant who expects his master will prepare for his reception; will keep his garments clean, and his hands, unpolluted with bribes, his feet shod with the preparation of the gospel. With desire and expectation will he awake to the emphatic cry, "Behold, the bride-groom cometh." Surely some fatal blindness has seized the mass of the religious world, that so little attention is paid to a subject of such vast importance.

The words of the Master are applicable to the present age, "Nevertheless when the Son of Man cometh will he find faith on the earth." Infidelity is on the increase, iniquity abounding, and the love of many waxing cold. Signs of the times. "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter time some shall depart from the faith." Also, "that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasting, proud," &c. The passage is rendered by some translators thus, "For Christians will become selfish, lovers of money, boastful, haughty, evil speakers, disobedient to parents, unthankful. unholy, without natural af-

fection, irreconcileable, slanderous, intemperate, fierce, enemies to good men, betrayers, rash, infatuated, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God, keeping to a form of godliness, but having cast aside the power thereof." If the above be not a just translation, it just suits the present age; never a more striking portrait drawn, spoken of the last times which should close the present dispensation.

Take either version and it is a dreadful description of the church, of professors, members of the church; for they are to have a form of godliness, without the power, and to be crying peace and safety at a time when destruction is at hand. Take the church in the aggregate and the prediction is fulfilled. The character perfected, so long foretold. No people in christendom more selfish, greater lovers of money, more haughty and intolerant, greater slanderers, than the very members of the church, and those who are teaching them. The old proverb will hold good while time lasts; "Like people, like priests." Show me an ungodly people, and if they have a priest at all, he will be just such a one. According to prophecy, there is to be a time when men will not endure sound doctrine. "But after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables." No time ever suited the above prophecy better than the present. No time when men were more industriously propagating error. Opposites cannot be right. Opposites are taught with unwearied industry. For religious fables the present age has never been surpassed, nor will it be. Much money, and many converts are made through the medium of the great *fable factory*.

We will now bring forward a third witness to prove the coming of the Son of Man, and the fall of antichrist, as being contemporaneous events. See Rev. xix. The personage that first appeared on a white horse in Rev. vi. 2. with a bow and a crown, was certainly the Messiah. The same personage appears a second time with many crowns. "And the armies which were in heaven followed him on white horses." Reader, examine where this scene is to be transacted, in the natural, moral, or the heavens of immortality. If you say in the natural heavens, or the heaven of immortality, you are at once placed in a dilemma, from which it will be difficult to extricate yourself. In either of these heavens you must find a "wine press of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God;" a false prophet, and a wild untameable beast; to wit, an ungodly tyranical government. It is very common in holy writ to represent despotic governments by ferocious beasts.

Now just go into the moral heavens, and see if suitable objects are not at once found. In God's moral government we have a beast, a false prophet, and a theatre where the wine press can, and may be trodden, without a strained application. A bloody and tyrannical government has risen in the church, or God's moral heavens, exercising authority, making laws contrary to, and above the laws of the Lord. Nor do I believe the great false prophet Mahomed is alluded to within the Apocalypse. Perhaps the Turkish empire is

pointed at under the figure, "great river Euphrates." But the false prophet in Rev. xix. 20. cannot be applied to the Mahomedan religion, without a copartnership can be shown between the government of antichrist and Mahomed. "And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshipped his image."*

Now, when did Mahomed work miracles, or his followers contribute any thing towards the deceptions which have been practised in Christendom, under the tyrannical reign of the beast or antichrist, and antichristian denominations? There is a fair co-operation between the beast and the prophet. The dominion of the beast throughout christendom, Catholic or Protestant, depends plainly and positively on the false prophet, or false teaching; this is a plain matter of fact proposition that needs no argument.

The leading features in the prophecy before us are, 1. Heaven opened. 2. A majestic description of the King of kings. 3. A dreadful overthrow of the beast and false prophet with the kings of the earth. This corresponds with all the prophecies which have been examined. "And I saw heaven opened"; to wit: a scene opening in God's moral kingdom; no other reasonable theatre can be found. In the passage before us is found one of the strongest arguments for our position relative to the word *heaven* being applied to God's moral administration. Upon this theatre, called heaven, is the wine press to be trodden. "And the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war against him that sat on the horse," &c. The kings of the earth cannot gather their armies into the heaven above. There is but one place where this scene can be transacted. "And, behold, a white horse"; "and the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; clothed with a vesture dipped in blood. And he treadeth the wine press of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS."

Are these calculated to soothe into slumbers? Are they images of peace? What is this King to achieve? What a dreadful work of destruction is he to perform on this beast—on the kings of the earth and their armies! It is evident from the face of the prophecy, that the King is to come previous to the overthrow, the dreadful destruction of the beast and false prophet with their armies. Place the King's coming at the close of time, and you must place the downfall and utter destruction of the beast and false prophet there also: then will antichrist by the means of false teaching, keep his authority in the

*I have my objections to the word miracle in the above quotation. A positive miracle does challenge our faith. A version before me reads—"Those *wonders* by which he seduced," &c. Dr. Campbell's version reads, "And with him the false prophet, who had wrought *signs* before him," &c. Since the rise of the man of sin many signs and lying wonders have been performed. Many now-a-days—all attributed to supernatural agency.

temple of God, supplanting his holy government: and the reign of the son of perdition is to be commensurate with time.

So then there is something not quite true in the holy book where it says the Lord is to be King over all the earth, and there is to be nothing to hurt or offend in all the holy mountain. But our teachers can spiritualize away the whole vision. If a part may have a spiritual meaning the whole must. If a part may be fulfilled in the heaven above, it all must; or if a part at the close of time, it all must. If Christ is to come on the clouds of heaven spiritually, then is this heaven to be spiritually opened; and the King is to wear a vesture dipped in spiritual blood; and there is to be a spiritual wine press, spiritually trodden; and all the spiritual fowls in the midst of heaven are called to the spiritual supper of the great God; to eat the flesh of spiritual kings, and their spiritual horses; and the beast and false prophet are to be cast spiritually alive into a lake of spiritual fire, burning with spiritual brimstone!! Spiritualizers have some monstrous absurdities in their way.

The concentratng point of all the terrible predictions in holy writ unfulfilled, is the downfall of antichrist, and the dissolution of the present Christian dispensation, not nature. This is the key that unlocks the whole arcanum of prophecy. This admitted, and the most insuperable difficulties at once vanish; the hand writing is at once made plain, and we see a beautiful system, a chain of prophecy, linked together and harmonizing for more than 2000 years, drawing to a close, ripening into events which will be perpetuated on the page of history while time endures. Until this fact be admitted, prophecy is never to be understood. Until the dissolution of nature be pushed out of view, and the dissolution of dispensations be substituted in its stead—I defy the wisdom of the wise, the learning of the schools, or the united efforts of all the clergy on earth, to furnish out a system on the prophecies that cannot be pulled to pieces—that can stand the scrutiny of common sense. God never proposes any thing to the faith of man contrary to reason, nothing in pointed opposition to the known and unchanging laws of nature.

At the head of all predictions in the future stands those which relate to the second visit the King of kings is to pay our earth. And this visit is to be antecedent to the downfall of the son of perdition, just as sure as there is truth in prophecy. This we have shown by the mouth of two or three witnesses.

Since the beginning of time nothing has been proposed to the faith of man of such importance, (immortality excepted) as the second coming of Christ; and it is scarcely agitated, and rarely believed. The Bible abounds with prophecy relative to this important event; and no subject has a greater claim on the attention of man; but few in holy writ so often proposed to his faith.

Since the beginning of time God's communications to the world have risen in glory and magnitude. The law was rehearsed in thunder from the smoking summit of Sinai—the gospel brought life and

immortality to light. The Messiah associating with and teaching his erring creatures the way of life and immortality.

A third display of glory will take place at the introduction of Christ's universal reign; "the everlasting gospel." When the present dispensation with its appendages will be rolled together as a scroll and laid aside; when the stars in the moral heaven will fall "unto the earth, even as a fig tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken of a mighty wind;" then our nobles and our great men in the church, those who have been misguiding and tyrannizing over God's heritage in their consternation, will hide themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains, and say "to the mountains and rocks, fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb. For the great day of his wrath is come, and who shall be able to stand." Then will be seen "coming in the clouds of heaven" him who was crucified on earth. The head whereon was placed a wreath of thorns will be encircled with a rainbow, wearing many crowns—escorted by "ten thousand times ten thousand" saints, and angels, "see the crucified shine." "Every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him: and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him." "Amen! even so, come Lord Jesus."

Reader, is this your repose? Are you "looking for and hastening unto the coming of the day of God?" Are you shod with the preparation of the gospel, and literally obeying every precept and command therein? Are you uncontaminated with sectarian zeal—unbitten with party rage? Against you will the Master prefer no charge for having misguided and scattered his flock—for having set his household at variance—for having beaten his servants and handmaids, for whom he shed his blood—for wounding him in the person of his followers? Alas! who will stand the scrutiny of the King, whose eyes are like a flame of fire.

[*To be continued.*]

Proposition for Union.

Brother Campbell,

ELDER JOHN KERR of the city of Richmond, who in October 1832 moved the Dover Association to "fulminate" its decrees against six of his brethren—has at last discovered the impropriety of such unchristian conduct, and possessed so much independence and Christian spirit as to publicly condemn this act of his, and all those that persist in such conduct towards their brethren. This is noble indeed in Elder Kerr, *and, if carried into practice,* must endear him to all the lovers of truth and righteousness, and will blot out all remembrance of former errors, and remove all unpleasantness from the minds of his brethren who have been forced to serve God, separate from those whom they loved and desired to live in union with,

if permitted to keep the commandments of Jesus, instead of the traditions of man.

I repeat it, Elder Kerr, if he succeeds in restoring union upon the New Testament alone among all those "who mourn the scandals of the times, and pant, and pray, and strive for universal holiness and peace"—will do more in his last days for the *salvation of the world*, than if every son and daughter of Abraham were to unite in what he calls "the great schemes of Christian enterprize which distinguish the present day" in their present divided condition—or than his brother Andrew has done for the last forty years by his metaphysical opinions. *Let the principles, now advocated by Elder Kerr, be carried out in practice, according to the language of our great Redeemer in his prayer to his Father—then the world will believe, the world will know, that the Father sent him, or Jesus did not know what would save men.* We hail the redeeming spirit that is about to pervade *Old Virginia.* She has always acted her part well in every trying hour. May this spirit of love to truth and righteousness, cover the earth as the waters do the great deep. Let those brethren, whose zeal has led them to *fulminate* their decrees against their brethren, *revoke them publicly* as Elder Kerr has done, (or condemns himself) and then the door will be open for *union* with the disciples of Jesus, and peace restored.

I do most earnestly request you to give Elder Kerr's letter in the Herald of the 24th of January, a place in the Harbinger for February, that strife and contention among the disciples of Jesus may be at an end. Then may we all go on, keeping the commandments of Jesus without the fear of offending each other or dividing asunder.

Yours in the Lord,

THOMAS M. HENLEY

[*Here follows Elder Kerr's Communication for the Herald.*]

IMPORTANCE OF UNION.

Brother Sands,

These are eventful times. The world is in violent fermentation. Political and religious establishments are in commotion. Contentions and strife abound. Many are running to and fro, and knowledge is increasing. Light is elicited. The corrupt mass is working off its impurities. The great ship is tossed upon the billows, but it shall outlive the storm—it is heaven-built—heaven-insured and heaven-bound. Jesus is on board—he delights to speak to the tempest when in its highest rage—he will arise and say, "Peace, be still," and all shall be calm. The last throes of the dying beast may convulse the earth, but he must expire; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it. Let no good man's heart fail him. The dove of peace shall yet unfurl his golden pinions over our sin-deranged world. Jesus, the Prince of Peace, lived praying for peace, and died bequeathing peace to his people. "I pray not for them alone, (the Apostles) *but for them also who shall believe on me through their word,*

that they may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you, not as the world giveth, give I unto you." The watchmen on the walls of Zion "shall see eye to eye." "The wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion, and the fatling together, and a little child shall lead them, and the cow and the bear shall feed—their young ones shall lie down together; and the lion shall eat straw like the ox, and the suckling child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice's den. They shall not hurt, nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea."

This is the prospect before us. These are the faithful and true sayings of God, and in view of these glorious things, what are our duties and our privileges? Shall we recline upon the silken couch of inglorious ease, and say, the "Lord will do his work in his own good time—we will stand still and see the salvation of God." So did not Paul—he was sound in the faith and equally sound in labors, and toils, and sufferings for the salvation of sinners, and the glory of his divine Master. He "testified to both Jews and Gentiles, repentance towards God and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ. He taught them publicly, and from house to house, with many tears constrained by the love of Christ, and knowing the terror of the Lord, he persuaded, and besought, and prayed men to be reconciled to God." He said, (and acted upon the glorious principle) "we are laborers together with God"—"we are workers together with him." Oh, what honor! Oh, what responsibility!! Is not the church called upon to rise and shake herself from the dust, and put on her beautiful garments? Is she not summoned to appear before her illustrious leader and commander, clad in armor of light? Let every man buckle on the whole armor of God, and be at his post. Let "*vigilance and holiness to the Lord*," be the motto inscribed upon every breastplate. "Blessed is that servant whom his Lord when he cometh shall find so doing." The great Redeemer accomplishes his purposes and fulfils his promises by the use of means. He has ordained that man shall be the honored instrument in building up his kingdom, and glory in the earth. We often utter with our lips, "Thy kingdom come." We profess to pray for the peace of Jerusalem—for the pacification and salvation of the world; but what are we doing for the promotion of these great and good objects? [Important question.]

Men and ministers of the same, or of different, denominations, after indulging in vapid vituperation, fulminate their anathemas against each other, and then pretend to pray for peace and union; this excites the ire of God and scorn of infidels. [A magnanimous confession! "Apples of gold in pictures of silver!"]

I lay this down as an axiom, that no man really prays for that which he does not ardently desire; and no man ardently desires that, he does not use all the means within his power to promote; conse-

quently, no man prays for that he does not labor to accomplish Desire is prayer, and desire will produce effort. *If we wish to ascertain the character of our prayers, let us inquire what is the character and extent of our efforts. This is the true test.* Now, I ask, what are we doing to promote peace on earth and good will among men? What are we doing to quench the coals of growing strife? What sacrifices have we made? What toils have we endured to bring the church to harmony and peace? [Fulminating anathemas against our brethren.]

Union is strength.—[when united with truth.] *The policy of satan is, "divide and conquer." The prayer of Jesus is, "that they may be one, even as we are one—I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one, that the world may know that thou hast sent me."*

Men of God must harmonize and co-operate. They must present one unbroken front to the common enemy; then "infidelity will hide her head, and all iniquity stop her mouth."

My mind has been recently led to this train of thoughts, by a letter from a venerable servant of God, who has long been a distinguished member of the Ketocton Association. He weeps over the desolations of Zion, and asks if nothing can be done to repair her broken walls, and restore peace and prosperity to her borders. He calls upon A. Broaddus, W. Y. Hyter, and myself, with "other ministers of age and experience," to take this subject into solemn consideration. *I now take the liberty of calling upon all ministers of Jesus, and all other men who mourn the scandals of the times, and pant, and pray, and strive for universal holiness and peace,* to reflect solemnly upon this subject. Is the cup of conciliation exhausted? Can nothing more be done to heal the bleeding wounds of our Zion? *Is there no further sacrifices which the Bible requires us to make upon the altar of peace and brotherly love?"*

I propose for the consideration of my pious and intelligent brethren, that we, at some proper time and place, have a solemn meeting, not to show our dexterity as polemics—not to form a confession of faith, (for we have the best that heaven could give) but to spend six or eight days in free and social conversation—in full, and frank, and scriptural interchange of views and feelings, mingled with solemn fasting and prayer to the great head of the church for more wisdom from above, and more of that spirit which marked his benevolent career. Will not our brother Gilmore, *and all other brethren who think us unsound in the faith,* (because we are favorable to the great schemes of Christian enterprize which distinguish the present day) meet us? Will they not attentively and affectionately hear us upon these momentous subjects? I think they will; and I further think, if we will enter upon them with the proper spirit, we shall understand one another, and hereafter live in love and peace, and the God of love and peace will be with us. O, that the spirit of God may lead us into all truth. Yours affectionately,

JOHN KERR.

Richmond, Jan. 13, 1834.

Thus we have the overflowings of the mind of Elder Kerr. We shall soon see whether the schism made by the Dover Association, will be repaired by them. In other words, whether he says one thing and will do another. We have always been for union with those disciples who keep the commandments of Jesus, and take all their lessons of "Christian enterprize" from him and his Apostles. We cannot consent to learn from others, and make them the means by which the Saviour accomplishes his purposes and fulfils his designs to the sons of men. I have italicised several lines. T. M. H.

IF I could believe that Elder Kerr means in the preceding communication what he says, I would congratulate him and the public on these favorable symptoms of returning sanity and sobriety, not only in his own individual case, but in all who act with him in the great drama of intolerance and proscription, in which he has by accident acted so prominent a part. The spirits that have raised the whirlwind and the storm are best qualified to allay it. If all the above professions of a good spirit are sincere, and will be carried out into practice, we would rejoice in the happy omens of more propitious times.

All the world must see that we have been forced into a separate communion. We were driven out of doors, because we preferred the approbation of the Lord to the approbation of any sect in christendom. If this be our *weakness* we ought not to be despised—if this be our *wisdom* we ought not to be condemned. We have lost no peace of conscience, none of the honor which comes from God, none of the enjoyments of the Holy Spirit, nothing of the sweets of Christian communion by the unkindness of those who once called us brethren.

"*More true joy Marcellus exiled feels,*
Than Cesar with a senate at his heels."

We have always sought *peace*, but not peace at war with truth. Union in truth, and union with truth are in our esteem true union, real strength, and social bliss. We are under no necessity to crouch, to beg for favor, friendship, or protection. Our progress is onward, upward, and resistless. With the fear of God before our eyes—the examples of all the wise, good, and renowned worthies of all ages before us to stimultae our exertions and to smile upon our path, with love to God and man working in our bosoms, and immortality in prospect—we have nothing to fear, nothing to lose that is worth possessing. Standing on the Rock of Ages, panoplied with the armor of light, with a helmet, breastplate, and shield from the armory of heaven—in our right hand the sword of the Spirit of heavenly temper, and our eyes fixed upon the great Captain of Salvation: bulls, anathemas, and decrees are as stubble to leviathan, and the opposition of the sectarian world as the spider's threads in the path of the elephant. Yet we would be gentle and easy to be entreated by the arguments of love and the indications of the spirit of a sound mind. And if these elders of the people who have occasioned the present disorder and distress are now really as penitent as they profess, let them nullify

their decrees and open a door of reconciliation, showing themselves honest and sincere in their overtures for peace.

On the Bible alone we will meet them in heart and hand. We shall open to them our doors, whenever they open theirs to us. If we cannot approve all their "benevolent schemes of this age of enterprize," we will permit them to give their money and their aids to every thing they call good works, and we only claim the right of private judgment, and of pursuing all the schemes of benevolence which we ascertain to be pleasing to God and beneficial to men. Where we cannot agree in opinion we will agree to differ; and a free intercourse will do more to enlighten us and them, and to reform all abuses than years of controversy and volumes of defamation. I doubt not but I express the feelings of many myriads of intelligent disciples when I thus reciprocate the first indications of a Christian spirit, and the first approach to the temple of reason and truth.

But, and if the elders of the people are not sincere in these protestations, and if they will not allow us the right of private judgment, and to every congregation the right to administer its own affairs as we would cheerfully award to them, then be it known to them and society at large, that we are not to blame for the state of things of which they complain; and that although we stretch our hand to the olive branch which they seem to extend to us, it is not because we fear their strength, their influence, or all they can oppose to us; for if in our infancy and imbecility we have in the face of all their opposition and united efforts, risen in a few years from nothing to many myriads, it is not to be imagined that they can stay our progress, or succeed in a course in which only disaster and ruin has marked their every step. But we love peace, and truth, and co-operation, and united effort in purifying the church and in converting the world. We, therefore, wait to hear from them more fully on this matter, and we shall consider the rescinding of their decrees as an unequivocal expression of their desire for a better order of things.

EDITOR.

Fasting---No. 3.

"To every thing there is a season," said the wise man, "and a time for every purpose under the heaven." So it had been under the Patriarchal and Jewish dispensations; and so it was under the Christian. David fasted when afflicted by the sickness of his child—Esther, Mordecai, and the Jews with them fasted when threatened with destruction by the machinations of Haman; and the king and the people of Nineveh fasted immediately after Jonah the prophet had preached, "Yet forty days and Nineveh shall be overthrown." "For," says the testimony, "word came unto the king and he arose from his throne, and he laid his robe from him, and covered him with sackcloth and sat in ashes. And he caused it to be proclaimed and published through Nineveh (by the decree of the king and nobles,)

saying, Let neither man nor beast, herd nor flock, taste any thing; let them not feed nor drink water." Joel iii. 6, 7. This is called (5th verse) 'the proclamation of a *fast*.' In these instances, and others which might be noticed, where we read in the Old Testament that individuals or a people fasted, we at once see there was *occasion* for it. So also in the New Testament. The Saviour spoke of occasions for fasting in saying, "The days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken away, then shall they (my disciples) fast;" and Luke, in his Acts of Apostles, speaks of their performance of this duty thus: "And as they were ministering to the Lord and fasting the Holy Spirit said, Separate to me Barnabas and Saul, for the work to which I have called them. And having fasted and prayed, and laid hands on them they dismissed them." (xiii. ch.) "And Cornelius said, Four days ago I was fasting to this hour. (x. ch.) And Peter, it appears, was fasting and praying when the messengers from Cornelius arrived for him; and it is said he became "*very hungry*." But it is not necessary we presume to make other quotations to show that the Lord not only required fasting as a duty, but furnished occasions for it; and that these occasions were thus observed by his primitive disciples.

These occasions we have seen were, after the Lord was taken away from them—when they especially needed divine support and direction—when they were about to set apart by solemn ordination some of their number to particular fields of ministerial labor, in the Lord's harvest. And on all such and similar occasions, we here infer, that it is proper for the disciples of Christ to fast now.

Is any one afflicted;—let him *fast* and *pray*. Is the state of vital religion low in any congregation—do its members forget their covenant obligations, and for weeks, and for months, absent themselves from its regular meetings, and from attendance upon its ordinances;—*then is there occasion for fasting*. Are there whisperings, backbitings, and uncharitable suspicions indulged in, and evil insinuations thrown out by one member against another—Is that wholesome rule of discipline, given by the Saviour, Matt. xviii. "If thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone," wholly neglected;—*then is there occasion for fasting*. Is a congregation destitute of a settled pastor, bishop, or overseer; and would they have the LORD give them one—a man whom HE would approve, and own and bless to their spiritual edification, and to the conviction and conversion of sinners;—*then there is occasion for fasting*. In fine,—Is a land or nation,—a town or country, visited, or threatened with a visit from famine, pestilence, or sword;—*then is there occasion for fasting*. CHOLERA has furnished,—is furnishing,—and probably will yet furnish, many occasions to Christians for fasting. O that they would more generally improve them in this manner, as they ought! "Who can tell," said the king and nobles of Nineveh, "if God will turn and repent, and turn away from his fierce anger that we perish not." And it is added, "God saw their works, that they turned from their evil way: and God repented of the evil that he had said that he would do unto them, and he did it not." Esther,

Mordecai, and the Jews with them, *in this way*, had power with God and prevailed, and so did others, and so have others both in ancient and in modern times.

ADELPHOS.

Fasting---No. 4.

"MOREOVER, when you fast, look not dismal, as the hypocrites, who disfigure their faces, that men may observe that they fast. Indeed, I say to you, they have their reward. But you, when you fast, anoint your head, and wash your face; that your fasting may not appear to men; and your Father, to whom, though he is unseen himself nothing is secret, will recompense you." Matt. vi.

Some professed Christians tell us, that the *mode* or *form* of an institution is nothing—only attend to the thing itself, it matters not *how*, and all is well. Others tell us, that the mode or form is every thing; and the thing itself may therefore be neglected. They tell us that fasting is not what the word literally imports; but simply 'an abstaining from sin'—a washing of the face and an anointing of the head, that we appear not to men to fast.—That we may eat and drink as much as we please—that we need not deny ourselves any good thing,—only put on our Sunday clothes, and Sunday countenance, and go to meeting and hear a sermon; and then return and praise or blame the preacher, and keep on eating and drinking: and this is fasting. So liable are mankind to extremes! But, you will observe, my brethren, that the hypocrites are spoken of as *fasting*, as much as the disciples. They performed all as far as related to the subject matter: (that is, *that* in which fasting essentially consisted,) but they erred in the mode or form of it—in the adjuncts or circumstances. They fasted: but the disfiguring of their faces that they might appear to men to fast, was not acceptable to Him who sees in secret: and so displeasing was it to him that the Saviour adds, "Indeed, I say to you, they have their reward."—That is, they have it as they go along in the reverence and praise of men. For their disregard to the *mode* or *form*, no reward is reserved for them to be conferred by your Father in heaven. Here observe, the sad or dismal countenance, the disfigured face, and the motive—that they might appear to men to fast, of the hypocrites; stand opposed to the anointing of the head, the washing of the face, and the motive—not to be seen of men, but of God, of the disciples of Christ. These adjuncts or circumstances we denominate the *mode* or *form* of fasting. Strictly and philosophically speaking, however, they are no more the *mode* or *form* of fasting, than is a mode or form of one of them—the real mode or form of a thing being inseparable from the thing itself. However, they are not altogether mis-named, if this name conveys the general meaning which is here intended by it. There is not, manifestly, that impropriety and absurdity in calling these adjuncts or circumstances, in a *figurative sense*, the mode or form of fasting, that there is in calling the subject matter of one thing, ***primarily*** and ***literally***, the subject

matter of another thing—for instance, the calling of sprinkling a mode or form of immersion, or immersion a mode or form of sprinkling.

We are taught by the mode or form,—the adjuncts or circumstances, (or, whatever else you please to call them)—of fasting, brought to view in our lesson under consideration, what God does, and what he does not require of us in performing this duty. He does not require a disfigured face, and a sad countenance, and a deal of parade and show of humility. He does require the contrary: and with the contrary, he requires that preparation of heart, which will enable us to pray, and seek in earnest what we pray for. A preparation of *heart* is necessary to acceptable fasting. There must be integrity and sincerity in our souls—we must from the heart forgive every one his brother his trespasses. If we have done wrong, we must feel willing to make reparation—to confess and forsake. In fine, we must feel willing to do, and *do it*, so far as we know, perfectly right. The Prophet Isaiah very strikingly confirms these remarks of ours in the 57th chapter of his prophecies: "Wherefore have we fasted, say they, and thou seest not? Wherefore have we afflicted our soul, and thou takest no knowledge? Behold in the day of your fast ye find pleasure, and exact all your labors. Behold ye fast for strife and debate, and to smite with the fist of wickedness. Ye shall not fast as ye do this day to make your voice to be heard on high. Is it such a fast that I have chosen—a day for a man to afflict his soul? Is it to bow down his head like a bulrush, and to spread sackcloth and ashes under him? Wilt thou call this a fast, and an acceptable day to the Lord? Is not this the fast that I have chosen? to loose the bands of wickedness, and to undo heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke? Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out to thy house? When thou seest the naked, that thou cover him, and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh."

The question has been asked, Is fasting a private, or a public, social duty? The scriptures we have already noticed answer this question. It is both. David, Cornelius, and Peter fasted alone, in private; Esther and her maidens, Mordecai and the Jews with him the king, the nobles, and people of Nineveh—and the prophets and teachers of the church at Antioch fasted publicly. Fasting being connected with prayer is proper wherever and whenever prayer is proper.

ADELPHOS.

Letters, &c. to A. Campbell---No. 2.

[CONTINUED.]

BUT you, my dear sir, cannot point to such vices among your Protestant brethren, as were universally practised at that time in the Church of Rome. You say the Methodists have "*a five-headed priesthood;*" but can you show the public a Methodist Bishop that

keeps his concubine, and goes as Tetzel did, from the pulpit where he had been selling at an extravagant price license to sin to the brothel? Can you point to one man in these United States, who is in communion with any church, whose moral conduct is as exceptionable as that of Leo X. or Henry VIII.? and you know vice of this kind was not rare in those days. To this fact all history bears ample testimony. I readily admit that the morals of Protestant christendom are very defective. We have not yet attained a practice to that for which we have been apprehended by our great Master. There is much reason in this respect, as in many others, for improvement. Many errors in speculation are doubtless to be found among the sons of reformation. Some doctrines which are held very sacred, and by some good Christians considered as fundamentals, will, in a more improved state of Christianity, be viewed in the same light we now view the doctrines of transubstantiation or the infallibility of the Pope. But I cannot learn that the reformation you and your brethren plead for, relates to moral improvement, and the correction of erroneous opinions in doctrine, so much as to forms of worship, or the regulation of the externals of Christianity. Now to me this is in spirit reforming us back into the dark of ages of Popery. Not that I would say that you are defective in the inculcation of moral truths, or that your sect is defective in practice. But what you seem to insist *most upon*, is, what you call a restoration to ancient usages; by which I understand you to mean, a belief in the forgiveness of sins by immersion, and the celebration of the Lord's supper every Lord's day, together with the peculiar form of church government which you think obtained in the days of the Apostles. The return to this state of things you seem to think would have a magical influence in making us all perfect Christians. Now to me the doctrine of *the divine right of church government* is as absurd as the opinion of the *Pope's infallibility;* and I would as soon be found gravely controverting the latter as the former. So thought your great friend George Campbell, and perhaps no man has, or ever will investigate this subject with more candor or ability than he has done. But because your Protestant brethren do not adopt the independent form of church government and believe in immersion as the only way of obtaining forgiveness of sins, you charge them with being apostates from the primitive faith and practice, and say they belong to *the Whore of Babylon*. Every thing they do is censured. All is wrong. And you array yourself against most benevolent institutions in the country, whether they have for their object the relief of the bewildered heathen, or the poor and destitute of our own land. Your religious feelings in this respect appear to me much to resemble certain characters we read of Judea in the days of Christ, who, notwithstanding they saw the works of the Saviour, asked, "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?"

You, my dear sir, by your writings and public disputations, are well known in the literary world. In this respect I am obscure and unknown; but I claim to have as general an acquaintance with the state of practical Christianity in this Western Country as you have.

In travelling pretty extensively for twenty years, I have contracted many friendships with men of different denominations, and it is with pleasure I bear witness to their moral and religious worth—their intelligence, and untiring zeal to support what they believed to be the interests of the great Redeemer's kingdom. And what may seem strange, perhaps, to the narrow-minded sectarian, I have even seen all this goodness connected with what *seemed to me* monstrously erroneous in opinion. Now what I have seen with my eyes and handled with my hands I must believe, your testimony to the contrary notwithstanding. I am not among those bigots described by Dr. Johnson, who stand opposed to rational reform. "There are some men" (says Dr. Johnson) "of narrow views and grovelling conceptions, who, without the instigation of personal malice, treat every new attempt as wild and chimerical; and look upon every endeavor to depart from the beaten track as the rash effort of a warm imagination, or the glittering speculation of an exalted mind, that may please and dazzle for a time, but can produce no real or lasting advantage.

"These men value themselves upon a perpetual scepticism; upon believing nothing but their own senses; upon calling for demonstration when it cannot possibly be obtained: and, sometimes upon holding out against it when it is laid before them; upon inventing arguments against the success of any new undertaking; and where arguments cannot be found, upon treating it with contempt and ridicule.

"Such have been the most formidable enemies of the great benefactors of the world; for their notions and discourse are so agreeable to the lazy, the envious, and the timorous, that they seldom fail of becoming popular and directing the opinions of mankind."

I do not believe that the Christian church has reached her most perfect state in any part of christendom. So far as my little influence extends I call myself *a reformer*, and I rejoice to believe that a great and glorious reformation is gradually going on among the nations of christendom. I greatly rejoice in the slow but majestic march of Reason and the triumphs of Eternal Truth. If I am not wholly mistaken, we are on the eve of a great moral revolution. Old and superannuated institutions are shaken to their centre, and are crumbling into dust. Opinions long cherished as true, and supported by great names, are now exploded and going fast down to oblivion. How different the moral and intellectual state of christendom now from what it was in the 14th century!

Many causes are contributing to this improvement of the human race; but none more, perhaps, than the art of printing. This I deem among Heaven's richest boons to our afflicted race. As a general principle, I think we may say, ignorance is the cause of vice. Such is the constitution of the mind, and such the moral government of God, that if man can be brought to see his interests, he will generally pursue them. Involved in error, like Ajax in Homer, he calls for light. Give him this, and he must improve. The Press is the great terror of despots. Before it their thrones are crumbling into dust. The philosopher Stewart says, that "the influence which printing is

likely to have on the future history of the world has not, I think, been hitherto examined by philosophers with the attention which the importance of the subject deserves." The revival of learning, which followed the Reformation, infidels vainly hoped would be the destruction of Christianity; but it has become one of her ablest friends.

Science is purifying Christianity from the absurdities connected with her in the dark ages; and refined, like gold from the crucible, she is coming forth to bless the world. The slow but steady march of the inductive philosophy, is gradually destroying the subtilties and fooleries of scholastic divinity, and restoring the Bible to her lawful throne. I agree with you that every believer in revelation should be alive to the striking attitude in which he stands to the world around him. He should carefully examine his religious creed, and not take it for granted that his fathers were infallible in their judgments. Great candor and prudence are necessary in a religious reformer. He should carefully distinguish between *mint* and *anise*, and the *weightier matters* of the law. It is not every error that is necessarily damning in its tendency, nor is every truth essential to men's salvation. Those who intend to be successful in reforming the errors of mankind should distinguish between that which is *abstractedly* right, and that which is so relatively. There is in religion, as in politics, an ideal state of perfection, which it is always proper for us to anticipate, but to which we can never expect to attain in this imperfect state of being. How many errors have religionists and visionary politicians fallen into by not distinguishing between what is abstractedly right and what is practicable. It is my decided opinion that intemperate efforts to reform the world have done the cause of truth as much harm as the blind bigotry of those who would prefer (as Rush somewhere says) "an *old lie* to a *new truth*." We see this illustrated in the history of the Puritans and of the French Revolution. On this important subject the philosopher Dugald Stewart has some very just observations, which should be well matured by every friend to reform. "Nor is it the employment of violent and sanguinary means alone in order to accomplish innovations, that this enlightened and humane philosophy has a tendency to discourage. By extending our views to the whole plan of civil society, and showing us the mutual relations and dependencies of its most distant parts, it cannot fail to check that *indiscriminate zeal* against *established institutions* which arises from *partial views* of the social system, as well as to produce a certain degree of scepticism with respect to every change, the success of which is not insured by the *prevailing ideas and manners of the age*. Sanguine and inconsiderate projects of reformation are frequently the offspring of clear and argumentative and systematical understandings, but rarely of *comprehensive minds*. For checking them, indeed nothing is so effectual as a general survey of the complicated structure of society. Even although such a survey should be superficial, provided it be conducted on an extensive scale, it is more useful, at least for this purpose, than the most minute and successful inquiries which are circumscribed within a narrow circle.

If it should teach us nothing else, it will at least satisfy us of the extreme difficulty of predicting with confidence the remote effects of new arrangements, and that the perfection of political wisdom consists not in encumbering the machine of government with new contrivances to obviate every partial inconvenience; but in removing gradually and imperceptibly the obstacles which disturb the order of nature, and (as Mr. Addison somewhere expresses it) "ingrafting upon her institutions." A prudent regard to the errors and prejudices of men, similar to that recommended by our philosopher, is strikingly illustrated in the conduct of our great Redeemer and his Apostles.

But in all religious reformations nothing is so important as the cultivation of a truly Christian spirit. A religious reformer, without the temper and spirit of Christ, is a curse to the world. The Puritans, who undoubtedly contended for many valuable truths, unfortunately did it in an *unchristian spirit.* Their spirit soon manifested itself, when, after having fled from the tyranny of England, they became worse persecutors of their Christian brethren than the Bishops were from whose tyranny they had fled. They established, indeed, the democratic form of church government; but, dear sir, a persecuting spirit is sometimes found where there are no Bishops or Presiding Elders.

J. A. WATERMAN

[*To be continued.*]

Reply to Mr. Waterman.

AS the stream is first in the fountain, so are all the meanderings of error in one great mistake. Had you and I the same views of a Christian spirit or true love, (alias charity) you would not have written me such an epistle. Before I follow you in all your reasonings and inferences, permit me then to call your attention to an examination of a Christian spirit and true charity. If we should be so fortunate as to agree in this you will find the stream of your censure is dried up, and that it will be unnecessary, except from courtesy, to pay farther attention to your details. We purpose not, however, only to attack the root, for I have sometimes seen green sprouts in a dead tree, but we shall girdle even the branches.

A Christian spirit and a Christian character, though frequently confounded, are not the same thing. Character is the fruit of the spirit—and, therefore, the attributes of the character are sometimes transferred to the spirit, as well as those of the spirit to the character. This, however, does not hold universally, for there are some attributes of the spirit which are never properly ascribed to the character of a man. We say a meek and gentle spirit, but not a meek and gentle character—a zealous spirit, but not a zealous character—a faithful spirit, but not a faithful character; and we say a just and righteous character, but not a just and righteous temper So great,

however, are the intimacies between spirit and character, that the great mass of writers and speakers, indiscriminately ascribe to the one all that is affirmed of the other. It is, indeed, from the character we learn the spirit of a man. We always expect to find a Christian spirit where we find a Christian character, and, therefore, he that impeaches the spirit of a man necessarily impeaches his character. When you, then, my good sir, lament my want of a Christian spirit, you very courteously deplore my want of Christian character.

Besides, the spirit of a man, like the Spirit of God, is known only by his words and his works. It is not possible to know the spirit of any person, but by what he says or does. It is, however, right and necessary that we should judge or try the spirit of a man by his words and actions; and if it be a duty to try the spirit of a man and to decide on its attributes, it is in the nature of things both right and necessary to express that judgment which we form of a man's spirit, when our judgment of it may be of use to others. In this decision of the matter I am happy in your concurrence with me: for you not only contend in *theory* that it is our duty to try the spirits of men and to decide according to their fruits; and, moreover, to express that judgment to the whole world, when we think it may be useful—but you actually practise it. In this we agree both in theory and in practice. We both judge men's spirits by their actions and express that judgment fearlessly and unequivocally. Thus you have decided on my spirit and expressed your judgment of it in the most intelligible terms—and not of mine only, but also of that of other men both living and dead. Thus the unchristian spirit of Luther, Calvin, as well as that of your humble servant, is not only decided, but avowed in your epistles as already published. But where your logic (to say nothing of your spirit) seems to me to flag, is, that you, professing a Christian spirit, should make that an evidence, a demonstration of an unchristian spirit in me, which proves beyond doubt a Christian spirit in yourself! The only proof you offer of an unchristian spirit in me is the manner in which I have judged and spoken of other professors; and while you judge and express your judgment of my spirit in language as unambiguous, ought I not, nay, ought you not to judge yourself, possessing an unchristian spirit. Twice two makes four in France as well as in England. That which proves an unchristian spirit in A. Campbell will prove it in J. A. Waterman.

But, sir, I condemn you not for trying men's spirits nor the spirits of teachers, for this we are both commanded to do—nor do I condemn you for expressing that judgment when you think it may be useful to others; but I censure you for making what you do yourself a proof of a Christian spirit in you and an unchristian spirit in me.

Again; I differ from you in what constitutes a Christian spirit; but hope that when you reflect a little more on the subject, you will agree with me, especially when you discover that my views are necessary to your justification as to my own.

What you say concerning the difference between the Saviour and

us as to knowledge of men's hearts, is cheerfully conceded. And if his strong and unambiguous denunciations sprang from his knowledge of men's hearts, and not of their works, open and manifest to all—then, indeed, are they not to be imitated by us. But if his denunciations, and those of his most distinguished followers, arose from an examination of the works of men as they appeared to men, and not from a discernment of their spirits, supernatural and divine—then your exception to the pertinence of his example falls to the ground. When Jesus says, "Alas for you Scribes, Pharisees, hypocrites, because you pay the tithe of mint, dill, and cummin, and omit the more important articles of the law, justice, humanity, and fidelity"—did he say this from other evidences than those which appeared to all men? Did he call Herod a fox, the leaders of the people hypocrites, and his public opponents the children of the devil, because of his knowledge of their thoughts, or of their actions?

Remember I do not say that we, on many occasions, are warranted in using such bold and unequivocal language; but I contend that you do not preclude me from the example by the solution which you have given of the conduct of the Messiah. As little would your philosophy reach such cases as Paul's address to Elymas the sorcerer, to Ananias the high priest, his reproof to Peter, and his expose of the false apostles. And what shall we say of Peter, Jude, James, and John who occasionally manifest such an "unchristian spirit" as you would call it. What says Peter of the false *teachers* who privily introduce destructive schisms, denying the Lord who bought them? Does he not call them audacious, self-willed, brute beasts made for capture and destruction, covetous as Balaam—wells without water and clouds without rain? Does not Jude reiterate the same? And what says John in his epistle concerning the antichrists and Diotrephes—and James of those who will be saved by faith alone, of the rich oppressors, of the adulterers and adulteresses who wore the garb of religion while they denied its power? Were you, my good sir, to consider all the instances on record in which the Apostles exhibited this unchristian spirit, and commanded others to follow their example—such as Paul to Timothy and Titus, you could not think that we have erred from the spirit of the gospel in the case and instances which you enumerate.

But, sir, when we take a full view of the Christian spirit as it appeared in the Master, it differs exceedingly from that which is now in high repute among us. It consisted not in one attribute, such as gentleness, meekness, condescension, sympathy, benevolence, zeal, patience, faithfulness, or holiness, but in a perfect combination of these all. Like the primitive colors in the rainbow none of these appears alone or independent of the others, but all shine together in perfect harmony, and each sheds a lustre upon all the others; still preserving, however, its distinct conspicuity. Some, indeed, admire one and some another of these excellencies, according to their various optics; but he whose vision is fitted to receive the full display of his whole character knows not whether to prefer his faithfulness to God,

his compassion for men, his exalted purity, his amazing condescension, his untiring zeal, his ardent devotion to the will of his Father, his meekness in the midst of provocation, or his uncompromizing firmness in the midst of all his enemies.

So great was his devotion to him who sent him, that it was his delight to do his will, and so great his zeal for his honor that it consumed his vigor. Keeping these attributes of his spirit before us, shall we say that mere gentleness, meekness, or patience, constitutes the Christian spirit? Shall we not rather look for a portion of the same zeal and faithfulness in contending for the honor of God's name, truth, and character, and the same impartial regard for every institution of heaven.

At what departure from the institution of heaven, at what infraction of the law of God, did he look with silence or indifference? Did he not declaim against all abuses and boldly reprove the errorists of his time? Did not John his harbinger lose his head because of his faithfulness and zeal?

History, my good sir, if it affords us any instruction at all, teaches us this lesson, that all the persecutions sustained from the hands of the Pagan emperors arose from what is now called the uncharitableness of the primitive Christians. One said they condemned not only all the religions, but ridiculed all the gods of the Pantheon. Another called this uncharitableness obstinacy to the government; and with Trojan said, 'If for no other cause than this they deserve to die.' For charity with the Pagans and with the moderns is pretty much the same thing. It is not love, but the expression of a favorable opinion for every person. The most charitable preacher with us is he who includes most persons in the way to heaven. He who widens the gate of life and broadens the way leading thither, so as to admit all the religionists of every creed and every practice—is the paragon of charity and possesses the most "Christian spirit." But, sir, you and I agree that charity is love; and that Paul's description of love, (1 Cor. 13.) most erroneously translated *charity*, is wholly another thing from that which most people denominate charity. Charity in that definition of it is not giving alms to the poor, nor expressing favorable opinions of our brethren or neighbors, but that love for the brethren which endures all things and which "rejoices not in iniquity, but rejoices in the truth." It has no affection for error or iniquity; it expresses none. It remonstrates, expostulates, reproves, and rebukes in all zeal and benevolence. It flatters not the wicked and censures not the righteous. It loves the truth and will tell the truth without disguise and without a mixture of error.

This, sir, with me, is true charity and a Christian spirit. He that censures me for the exercise of it, mistakes either the thing itself or my meaning, as much as he who censured his neighbors for telling him that his house was on fire and if he did not escape from it he must be consumed, or he who told the physician he was cruel, because he said his patient must die if he took not his medicines.

We may err in our views of christendom, in supposing with you that all Protestant sects are out of Babylon—that the Mother of Harlots has no daughters in America—that neither the Church of England nor John Wesley s reformation of it has one drop of the blood of the old mother or grand mother in their constitution, laws, discipline, and worship—that they are the true Simon Pure of all christendom, untainted in body or spirit, because Methodist Bishop have no concubines, nor presiding elders indulgences in their pockets; I say we may err in our modes of reasoning, but in expressing our judgment or in acting in accordance with it, we rather exhibit the Christian spirit and true love than the contrary; for in suppressing our convictions, or in acting contrary to them, we should indeed stand condemned in our judgment as possessing and exhibiting a "very unchristian spirit indeed."

By this time I presume so much upon your good sense as to infer that you will have perceived that you begun at the wrong place—when you attacked my unchristian spirit, rather than my reasonings upon Methodism, or any other *ismatic religion.* Convince my judgment that Methodism is primitive Christianity in faith and practice—or attempt to do this, rather than to arraign my Christian spirit for affirming that a raven is not a dove, or that a dove is not a raven. But, sir, in attempting to turn the eyes of Methodists and other sectarians from their own condition and character to my uncharitableness and unchristian spirit, you remind me of the lawyer, who, to silence his own convictions, or to sustain himself with the congregation amongst whom he worshipped, instituted an action against the Parson for having charged him and others with adultery in the presence of the whole community, because in his sermon he told the whole congregation that "daily, in thought, word, and deed they broke the whole ten commandments." But we expect to make a farther application of these principles in our next.

EDITOR.

For the Millennial Harbinger.

Henry Grew to A. Campbell.

BOSTON, December 26, 1833.

Dear Brother,

BEING informed of your absence from home, I have delayed forwarding the present communication.

Although in view of the divine command, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is ONE LORD," I must dissent from the opinion of my friend respecting the unprofitableness of a calm and scriptural discussion of the question, Is Jehovah one or three? it would be improper at present to urge a publication of a particular reply to your remarks on my last letter. I must, however, appeal to your candor, (and I believe I shall not appeal in vain) in claiming the correction of a misapprehension of my views in one or two respects.

Your declaration to your readers that "brother Grew would not believe any thing which he cannot comprehend," is entirely incorrect, and unwarranted by

any thing I have written. If brother C. says "there are at least two or three matters in this great creation which I cannot comprehend," brother G. says there is not one thing which he can comprehend. I reject not your opinion of a "society in God," because it is incomprehensible; but because it is, in my belief, no part of divine revelation. If you, or any other person, will produce a single declaration of divine truth, that God is three persons, or that the one God is the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; or any passage which necessarily implies this idea, you shall hear no objection from me of—how can this be?

Is it fair, my brother, to charge me with not believing any thing I cannot comprehend, because I will not allow you to use an unscriptural phrase, i. e. "society in God," without a corresponding intelligent idea? Is it fair thus to charge me because I will not admit that God is THREE, in direct violation of of his own plain and positive revelation that he is ONE? Mr. Stuart justly remarks, "We are not allowed, by the common laws of language, to assert any thing which, when examined, proves to be either a contradiction, or an incongruity; and then to take refuge from objections which may be made to our language, under the pretence that the subject is mysterious, and, consequently, it is improper to urge investigation respecting it. It may be true, indeed, that the subject of which we speak is mysterious; but what I have expressed about such a subject, if I have used language with any propriety, is, of course, only what I knew or conceived about it in my own mind. This can certainly be made intelligible to another mind; and there is, therefore, no mystery in my *expression;* at least there ought to be none."

The other misapprehension, to which I desire to solicit your attention, is to be found in your remark, "On your hypothesis no man owes but a few cents more to Jesus Christ than to any of the ancient martyrs." An inference so repugnant to every pious heart, my dear brother, ought not to have been charged upon my hypothesis without more proof of its legitimacy than you have given us. If I imagined the glorious Redeemer to be only a perfect MAN, or if I predicated all his real humiliation, suffering and dying for us, on human nature, as many Trinitarians do, you would have some reason for such an inference. You know that this is not the case. For many years the very consequence you have suggested has been a strong objection in my mind to humanitarian and trinitarian systems. I shrink not from the closest investigation on this point. I deny that any man's views on this important subject, imply greater love of Jesus Christ to us, and consequent greater obligation to him, than my own, excepting those of the man who boldly avows that the immutable Jehovah really humbled himself and divested himself of his glory, and that the ever-living Jehovah really died. Will you affirm this? I beg your candid consideration of the principle, that we are to predicate the virtue of the Saviour's mediatorial service of love for us, and our consequent debt of love to him, on the dignity of the nature, and excellency of the character which really suffered and died for us. If you say that the eternal Jehovah was united to the suffering, dying humanity, you can say, that we are indebted to Jehovah for such a union; but to say that we are indebted to Jehovah for a real humiliation and death for us, without believing that Jehovah really humbled himself and died, is not only an illusion, but a contradiction. I repeat, for the truth's sake, the question, Will you affirm that the immutable and ever-living God offered himself to God, i. e. (for the consequence is unavoidable) to another immutable and ever-living God? No. You admit that in the mediatorial economy the Father *is the only God.* Is not, then, *your* suffering, dying Redeemer, in all his mediatorial service of love, *dependent?* Is not, then, the debt of love *you* owe to Jesus Christ for real humiliation, suffering, and death, due to a *dependent* being? It is easy, indeed, to complain of "the metaphysico-theologico dissecting knife." But can you say that your debt of love for the real humiliation, suffering, and death of the Saviour, is due to him as an *independent* being, when you acknowledge that in all this work of wondrous mercy, he was *dependent?*

I admit, indeed, (and so must you, as you acknowledge him to be depend-

ent) that Jesus Christ owed all, not excepting his life, to the Father, for the purposes divine wisdom and love required it. He was under law to God. He *was obedient unto death.* It was "*just*" for him to submit to his Father in all things. But I still affirm that he was not required to die *on his own account.* It pleased the Father to make his life an offering for sin, but *not his own*, for he had none. He was cut off, but *not for himself.* For our sakes he who was rich became poor, that we through his poverty might be made rich. It was a voluntary act of condescension and love passing knowledge. As in him who gave himself for us, I contemplate the concentration of a dignity of nature and excellency of character far exceeding the combined dignity and excellency of all other created intelligences, I feel assured that my hypothesis is chargeable with no such debasing consequence as you have inadvertently imagined. My conceptions of the unparalleled glory of the only begotten of the Father, are such, that I apprehend the cessation of his existence would be a greater loss to the Universe than the entire destruction of all other beings, God only excepted. I admit that there is no comparison between finite and infinite; and that there must be, and ever will be, an immeasurable distance between Jehovah and all other beings. But the comparison you have made, I beg you to observe, is between imperfect and impotent men, and the perfect and matchless Son of the Blessed. Our ideas of God's creative power, and of the almost infinite degrees or grades, which there may be, in the scale of created intelligences, are too limited. After all, you must admit that your inference is drawn from the principle, that I represent the Mediator as being *dependent*, and that you have yourself so acknowledged him.

If I have "not once adverted" to your "strongest points," I can sincerely assure you that I have failed to do what I designed. As I hope, through divine favor, truth is my object, I desire to know, and fairly examine, every objection to my views. Your own writings confirm me in my present belief. You have advanced one step towards the temple of truth, in your last communication. Knock off the last shackle of the Athanasian dogma, and enter in. You remark, "We worship God the Father, as the Father, as our Father who is in heaven, *and on him alone all our worship* terminates." See now, beloved, your alternative, and for the truth's sake inform us whether you believe that the Father is the only person in Jehovah, or that the two other equal persons are entirely excluded from the worship of the Deity?

May the favor of our Lord Jesus Christ rest upon you, and your faithful labors of love for his name's sake!

Ever yours in Christian love,

HENRY GREW.

Reply to brother Grew.

My dear Sir,

YOU, doubtless, as well as all my readers, feel that I have been reluctantly constrained to make a few remarks on your favorite point, chiefly because of my courtesy to those who differ from me in theory or faith. You made such an appeal to my candor and impartiality as could not fail to make room for your first letter on your views of the person and glory of the Messiah. Reluctant as I was to discuss such matters, I gave you a hearing, accompanied with a few passing remarks—dissenting, indeed, from your main positions. This called forth a second elaborate defence from you: I published it without reply, other than a few notes on the margin to show you and others that I would not be forced into a controversy which had not benefited society, nor been satisfactorily decided in 1500 years. You have again compelled me to give place to a farther defence. Because

I will not be one-sided nor proscriptive, to obtain a hearing through my pages, you know it is only necessary to oppose my views, and to offer something in the way of argument, and appeal to my candor.

I am more opposed to a discussion of this question than any other—for various reasons:—Because it has been the *Alpha* and the *Omega* of the preaching and writing of hosts of the living and the dead, as if eternal life depended upon our capacity to comprehend or explain the *modus* of the divine existence. In the next place, it is utterly beyond the limits of human power to form any ideas of spiritual existence but by analogies from nature; and these are wholly inadequate to teach us the nature of God, farther than he has been pleased to make himself known. Moreover, after Trinitarians, Unitarians, Arians, Sabellians, and all others have argued the matter according to all their fancies and modes of thinking, their conclusions are alike incomprehensible and unintelligible—alike unscriptural and irreconcilable with our reasonings from analogy.

If reasoning from nature and analogy be employed in this question it will aid us in nothing; for we hold it to be impossible to conceive how God can have a Son, in the true and unfigurative import of that word; yet the Father has himself thus introduced Jesus to the world as his only begotten Son—"This is my Son, the beloved, in whom I delight." But I argue if Paul heard things in the third heavens which it was impossible to utter in human language, what shall we think of the powers of human speech to explain the divine nature, or the relation of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit! The existence of one God, and the existence of one Son of God, and the existence of one Spirit of God, are alike evident from revelation, and alike incomprehensible to human nature in its most cultivated state.

If, then, my good sir, you could make the Scriptures more intelligible, or the subject more comprehensible, we ought gladly to hear you and acquiesce in your reasonings. But when your conclusions are elaborated and expressed in your most approved terms and phrases, they are as reprobate (in the judgment of Apostles and Prophets) as you imagine the Trinitarian hypothesis. You complain of the phrase "society in God," not because it is incomprehensible, but because it is an unscriptural phrase. And what is your phrase—"that the Son had a beginning of existence"—or your phrase "one supreme God" and "God in a subordinate sense?" Are these scriptural phrases?

If you did not wish me to give you my ideas in my own words, you ought not to have asked me any questions upon the subject. It is rather singular, that having solicited my views in my own words, you should now object to my using any other words to express my ideas than those found written in the book. Perhaps you are now right on this matter, and therefore I shall be always justified by you in using no other words than the Holy Spirit teaches. This, indeed, is our wisdom.

I do not know, however, what *nature* you assign to THE WORD that was in the beginning with God, and that was God; for you say it is not the human nature—it is not the angelic nature—it is not the divine

nature. I know of but three natures in the unity of the universe. Now the Word that was made flesh was not flesh before Adam, but since; yet he was before not only Abraham, but Adam. He did not assume the nature of angels Paul informs me; and if he did not possess the divine nature, it remains for you to inform us of that nature which before time he did possess.

You ask me for only one text of Scripture which says—what? the precise words you have put together. No, indeed. There is no Scripture which says that Africans are the sons of Adam; shall I thence infer that they are not? The Scriptures say that THE WORD was God—and the Word of God was *in the beginning with God*—and that the Word *made all things*—and *was made flesh*. But this does not say what you demand.

You would have me worship a dependent. Yes! Dependence does not prove inferiority or disparity in nature. The Father is as dependent on the Son as the Son is dependent on the Father. A Father can no more exist without a Son than a Son without a Father! My dear sir, it is all the illusion of *relative terms* which prevents you from admitting that there is a plurality as well as unity in the divine nature; or that God has one only begotten Son; who was formerly the Word, and now the Son of God; and as truly "*by nature God*" as the Father himself.

But pardon me for departing so far from the good lesson which you have given me. You asked me *five* questions. I answered them in my own words, and then you very gravely told me my answers were not in the words of the Book. We may err just as much in talking of "the unity of God" as of plurality in the divine nature. Neither of them are words taught by the Holy Spirit. "The nature of God" is itself a very questionable phrase, though we have something like it from Paul, who, speaking of the idols of the Gentiles, says, "By nature they are not Gods." For my part, I believe that God, who is Spirit, has a SPIRIT, and a WORD, which *Word* was made flesh, and is now "the only begotten Son of God." This I *believe* on testimony, though I cannot comprehend it any more than I comprehend the union of body, soul, and spirit in myself.

I am content to speak of my God and Father, of my Lord and Saviour, and of the Holy Spirit in the words of *the Book;* and I think by this time you will doubtless agree with me in this course as the wisest, the safest, and the best.

The speculations upon *trinity* and *unity*, which have filled all borders of the land are as useless as the Aristotelian categories, and have been the derision of the enemies of the Bible. They have never done any good, but much evil. So I judge, and I think you also judge with me. Hereafter, then, let us all speak in the language of the Book. Let us speak of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit in the words of the good Book; and in doing this, we shall think the same thing, and induce others to abandon their speculations and to obey the gospel, rather than dispute about Trinitarianism, Arian-

ism, Unitarianism, or Socinianism. In doing this, may mercy and peace be multiplied to you through the knowledge of God, and of Jesus Christ our Lord! EDITOR.

Notes on a Tour to New York---No. 7.

ON Thursday evening, the 12th of December, after a pleasant passage through New Jersey, via Princeton, and up the Delaware, we safely arrived at Philadelphia, and were very kindly and hospitably received at the residence of our brother Brindley. Extremely exhausted from our much speaking in the city of New York, we thought it due to human nature to breathe a few days the good atmosphere of Philadelphia, and therefore did not open our lips in public till Lord's day morning, when we addressed the congregation in Bank street. A general address to the disciples on *moral regeneration*, growing out of the conversation with Nicodemus, was the burthen of the morning. In the evening of the same day we spoke of the times and seasons, the past, the present, and the future, to a congregation assembled in the German Baptist meeting-house, in the Northern Liberties. Considerable difficulties in obtaining suitable houses, much retarded our progress in this city of brotherly kindness.

Some grant was made of Mr. Chambers' house, one of the most interesting and liberal-minded of the Presbyterian ministry in that city. The Baptists, like the Jews of old, however, accosted this gentleman, and represented me as coming to create confusion among the Baptists, (magnanimous object!!) and remonstrated on the dangers to be apprehended in case Mr. Chambers opened his house. If these menaces did not operate on the mind of Mr. Chambers, they, with the superaddition of the insinuation that I was a Unitarian, so harassed the eldership of the congregation as to the expediency of the measure, that they could not decide in time for the publication of my appointments. Mr. Chambers, who, in times past, was better acquainted with me than any of these gentlemen, gave me the assurance that he believed not the charges nor the insinuations preferred against me, and would himself on any hypothesis give me a hearing.

The Lombard street meeting house, a very spacious and convenient building, the property of the Universalists and of the citizens, at least one half of every Lord's day, was readily and courteously tendered by the owners. On Tuesday evening, the 17th, we commenced a series of discourses in that house, which we prosecuted there on the evenings of the 19th and 20th, and in the Callow Hill street on Sunday afternoon; the morning and evening of the first day we addressed the brethren and friends in Bank street. The topics in these discourses were those pertaining to the rise, progress, and genius of the New Reign or Kingdom of Heaven, its constitution, laws, ordinances, and worship, with all the rights, immunities, and privileges of its citizens. During the first week seven or eight were immersed, and on the Lord's day were received into the congregation of Christ in Bank street.

On entering the pulpit in Callow Hill street meeting house, we found a number of queries addressed to us on the evidences of the Christian religion, and sundry items of the popular systems of the day. To these we gave replies, and went into an analysis of the radical errors of all human religions. The audiences were large and attentive, and composed chiefly of gentlemen.

In Philadelphia report says that the ladies are more devout than the gentlemen—at least so far as the church going part of devotion extends. The gentlemen generally mind their business, and the ladies go to church—on all working days at least. This is sometimes the case also on the days of rest. Whether it be owing to the want of entertainment on the part of the preachers, or sense in the doctrines, I cannot decide; but we had occasion, from the frequent remarks of the citizens, to notice the great disproportion between males and females in our various meetings. On the few occasions we attended other meetings, we saw some half dozen ladies for one gentleman; and with us it was about the same ratio of males to females.

On Monday evening, the 23d, we addressed as many as could find admittance into the Christian church in Christian street. Our theme there was, *that God is more willing to save sinners than they are to be saved.*

On Christmas day we delivered a discourse to a large audience in Callow Hill street, on the subject of faith, (Heb. x. and xi.) On the preceding evening we called in a few minutes to hear Mr. Maffitt, a very celebrated ladies' preacher in the Methodist society. He has a fine voice, and *performs* well as a *musician.* He gave us two *solos* in honor of Christmas eve, as well done (we suppose) as is usual on the *stage*, and a good common-place exhortation. He was followed by his good *brother*, Dr. Cushman, a *Baptist preacher*, who consecrated his *solos* by prayer. Mr. Cushman is a very *charitable* man, and waited upon Mr. Maffitt with all courtesy. He arose after his *brother* Maffitt had sat down to express a single thought, "which," said he, "I have not learned from any book, read from any author, nor heard from any preacher!" This, of course, excited all our curiosity, and stirred up all our powers of attention. It was this: "How wonderful the foreknowledge of God, and his faithfulness in keeping his promise! This," continued he, "is Christmas eve. It reminds us of the nativity of our Lord. Now it was foretold by Jacob that 'the sceptre should not depart from Judah till the Shiloh came.' This prophecy was now within 24 hours of expiring without being verified; for had not Jesus been born just that evening on the next day, the decree of Augustus concerning the taxing of Judea would have forever prevented its accomplishment and falsified the promise delivered by Jacob." *Original*, truly, thought I, and worthy of the age of the preacher! But who that can think, will wonder at the progress of scepticism when such are the champions of the Christian religion! However, the audience seemed to admire the wisdom of the preacher and to be satisfied that it was all as sound as orthodoxy itself.

On the evening of the 27th, in Callow Hill street, we lectured on

Ephesians, chap. iv. on the constitutional grounds of unity in the Christian kingdom. It was discovered that a latent scepticism greatly obstructed the progress of the gospel in this city; and that, although there was but a very few who dared openly to assemble under the banners of scepticism, yet there was evidently a concealed dubiety lurking within many minds on the pretensions of the author of Christianity. At the solicitations of many of the brethren and friends, we proposed to deliver one discourse at the Musical Fund Hall, on the evidences of the divine authenticity of the gospel. This room, the largest in the city, rents for 40 dollars per night. Contributions for defraying the expense were offered, and the appointment was made.

On the Lord's day morning, the 29th, a few more disciples, who through the week had been immersed by our faithful fellow-soldier Dr. John Thomas, were added to the congregation. We addressed the congregation and as many auditors as could gain admission into the house, on the 3d chapter, 1st epistle to the Corinthians—after which the disciples broke the loaf as usual. Brother Ballantine, though feeble in health, is generally able to attend on the Lord's day. This aged, venerable, and much esteemed brother, usually presides in the congregation, supported by our much esteemed brothers Flake and Thomas, who, with other brethren, take a deep interest in the edification of the congregation. They are surrounded, indeed, with very unpropitious circumstances, together with the inveteracy of old habits, which seem to obstruct the spread and power of the ancient faith in this city. After the discourse this forenoon four persons more came forward to confess the Lord, and some of the baptized disciples of other congregations united with them; so that about sixteen persons were added during our visit to the number of the disciples.

Anxious to hear Dr. Brantly, our warm-hearted and faithful opponent, and having an invitation to dine with brother Rhees of Camden, on the preceding Saturday, a protracted meeting being in progress in the Baptist church in that place, at which the Doctor had an appointment to preach at 3 o'clock—I crossed the Delaware and prepared myself for the gratification of hearing a Philadelphia Doctor deliver himself according to the standard of orthodoxy. That the Doctor had some reason to expect us, we had from certain incidents good reason to conjecture, and therefore I prepared myself to hear with all attention whatever might be tendered to our edification. Dinner was despatched, and we hastened to the place of meeting. The ministers and deacons sang and prayed three times, yet the Doctor still delayed his coming. The congregation looked to every opening of the door with expectation; but "hope deferred maketh the heart sick." The stipulated hour was now forever passed, and half an hour had followed it to the years beyond the Flood. Despair ensued, and it was faithless to expect this "legate of the skies" any longer. By some singular and unexpected turn in the hearts of this Regular Baptist congregation, in their distress they called upon me to preach to them. I heard their request, and immediately ascended the consecrated steps and entered 'the sacred desk.' I read them Peter's speech from Acts iii

and besought them to repent and be converted, that their sins might be blotted out, that seasons of refreshment from the presence of the Lord might be sent to them, &c. &c. After the discourse we recrossed the Delaware, musing upon what had become of the Doctor, for as yet we did not understand what manner of man he was. He has, however, since been found at Azotus, and in the chariot of the *Religious Narrator* is triumphing over the heresies of the "Restorers"!

On the evening of the Lord's day we repaired to the Musical Fund Hall, which, though capacious as it is, was found by far too small to admit all those who desired to hear. We trespassed so far upon the patience of a Philadelphia audience as to detain them three hours and twenty minutes on the reasons of the Christian's hope in God, that there shall be a resurrection of the just and unjust, and that to them that look for him shall the crucified Messiah appear a second time to their eternal salvation. Thus closed our labors on the evening of the 29th December in that city. Exhausted with so much speaking, we had no strength nor inclination to make any memoranda of the outlines of our discourses in Philadelphia. We only now recollect the topics.

Before the sun rose the next morning we were on the Delaware turning our face to Baltimore, at which place we safely arrived on the same evening. We found the Baltimore brethren still more happy than when we left them. A number had been immersed during our absence, and other accessions had increased their joy. We continued with them to the morning of the 3d of January, and delivered three addresses in Scotti's Hall, and some two or three more confessed the Lord. The church had received in all more than twenty new members, and were rejoicing in the Lord and in one another for the truth's sake. We turned our face to the great and mighty West, our brother Henshall of Baltimore, and brother Pickering from New York, accompanying us as far as Hagerstown, Md. in the vicinity of which place we stopped on Saturday and Lord's day at our good brother Funk's and our friend Whitmore's. We spoke two or three times to the brethren and citizens of Washington county, and broke the loaf with the disciples on the Lord's day. Three confessed the Lord on Saturday evening, and were immersed in the night at Whitmore's mill on Beaver creek. The infant church in that place is doing well. If I mistake not, about fifty persons united in the commemoration of the Lord's death.

After the business of the day we repaired to Hagerstown and resumed our seat in the stage; and on the morning of the 8th of January, after a sleepless and hazardous jaunt across the mountains, we safely arrived at Bethany, the place of beginning.

Thus ended our tour of three months and four days, making a circuit of about 1700 miles, without the slightest accident or injury. We had the satisfaction of forming many new acquaintances, of seeing some seventy or eighty persons introduced into the kingdom; and although we delivered some seventy or eighty public discourses, many of them under very exciting circumstances, we still had left

physical energies sufficient to endure the fatigues of a rough and rapid transportation across the Allegany mountains in about two days. The Lord be praised for all his mercies to us and to the sons of men!

EDITOR.

Progress of Reform.

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

BALTIMORE, Md. February 11, 1834.

On the 28th ult. our brother D. S. Burnet came to this city on his way home to Cincinnati. We again rented Scotti's Hall, in South street, that the citizens might have an opportunity to hear the gospel, (I dont use the word *ancient* more than *modern*, for I think neither is in the Scriptures, only the gospel of God.) He commenced on Friday evening, January 31. Saturday evening was very stormy, yet we had meeting. On Lord's day afternoon and evening the Hall was full. When our brother gave an invitation to those whose minds were made up to obey the gospel, one came forward. On Monday, the 3d, at 7 o'clock, the good news was again proclaimed. At the close an invitation was given, and the first that accepted was the dear little daughter of our friend G— A—; seven others followed, all of whom were immersed next morning at the Spring Gardens. On Tuesday evening again eight obeyed the Lord. On Wednesday morning they were immersed. On Wednesday evening seven came forward, and were immersed on Thursday morning. On Thursday evening five came to show their submission to their Lord, and were immersed on Friday morning. On Lord's day morning four were immersed, one of whom came forward at the river. At our next meeting five more confessed the Lord and were immersed. Besides these 38 which came out from the world, twelve baptized persons from the other churches joined us; so that in about ten days we have received *fifty new members*. We are now above one hundred. Some of the new converts are little girls and boys, say from 10 to 14. They are, however, as intelligent as any of their years which can be found. You know many of them. Among them are the daughter of our friend G. Austin, the daughter of our brother and sister Sands, the daughter of our brother Thomas, and the adopted daughter of our brother and sister Bell. I question if many persons of five times their age can give a better reason of the hope which is in them. Ask them for their Christian experience, they have none to tell—no, not one word. But ask any of them, 'My dear, do you expect to rise from the dead?' 'Yes, that is my joy, that when my Lord Jesus shall appear I shall be like him, for I shall see him as he is; and for this end and purpose I purify myself even as he is pure.'

After these children came forward there was a chattering all round—"What do these people mean?" "These children are not fit members of a church." "Can they eat the Lord's supper understandingly?" and many like sayings. We could hear comments on every side.

A day or two after there was a little daughter of respectable parents, under ten years, died, (see the account in the paper I send you,*) and from the account

*Elizabeth Carson, (the daughter of George Carson, Esq. of this city) who died of scarlet fever on Wednesday, deserves at the hands of her Pastor, who loved her most tenderly, a testimony that could be borne for very few children. She was not quite ten years old; and yet she was a consistent member of the Second Presbyterian Church in this city, and, in the judgment of all who knew her, a regenerated person. During protracted religious services in that church, in the month of December last, this child was observed by her father, who is a member of the same church, to go on one occasion and seat herself in one of

given of her in the newspapers of that day, all were satisfied this little girl died a sincere Christian. Hence our practice was got over, and no more is said of our receiving children. The reason why many more children are not following the Lord, is because of the neglect of those under whose care they are placed, whether parents or guardians. The Scriptures are neglected—that which is given to make men wise to salvation is thrown out of use in the family and school. A very religious man (now dead) said to me he would not have the Scriptures put into the hands of children until they were of mature age. What a mistake! Had it been so when I was boy, not 9 years of age, what would have been the consequence? I could read. The 139th psalm filled me with fear. I was fully persuaded of what it says of the Lord:—

"O Lord, thou hast searched me, and known me.

Thou knowest my down-sitting and mine up-rising; thou understandest my thought afar off.

Thou compassest my path and my lying down, and art acquainted with all my ways.

For there is not a word in my tongue, but lo, O Lord, thou knowest it altogether.

Thou hast beset me behind and before, and laid thine hand upon me.

Such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is high, I cannot attain unto it.

---

the pews reserved for those who were more particularly impressed with the need of salvation. After service was over, the father called her attention to the fact of her having, through mistake, sat in one of those seats. She replied that she understood those seats to be set apart for such as were anxious to have their sins pardoned and be saved from ruin; that such was her state of mind; and therefore, as she wished for the prayers and instructions of Christians, she had acted as she had. On another occasion she went up among perhaps forty persons, to the same seats; and after the services were over, and while the crowd was still slowly getting out of the house, this child pressed through the the mass of people, and with her face covered with tears, and her whole person heaving with suppressed emotion, threw herself into the arms of her Pastor, exclaiming, "Oh! sir, will you not teach me the way to get my sins pardoned and my soul saved?" Some time after this, she presented herself, in connexion with another little girl somewhat older than herself, and declaring her belief in Jesus Christ as her Saviour, asked for admittance into the church. The case was new to all who were called on to act in relation to it—on account of the extreme youth of the child—and yet the evidences of a new heart were so strong in this case, that the parents of the dear child, the Pastor and session of the church—several other ministers, and many private Christians, saying one to another, 'If this person were fifty years old, we should consider her case a very clear and marked case of conversion'—joyfully received her into the church of Jesus Christ, and sat down with her and a multitude of other converts around the emblems of his dying love. Her career has been short, but most blessed. Lovely in person—pure in heart—ripe for heaven—her Redeemer has taken her from the wrath to come, and she reposes, a glorified spirit, in the bosom of God. Her memory shall be like precious ointment to our souls.

R. J. B.

What a pity that none of these preachers and teachers could have guided this interesting and dear child to the words of Peter, and the pledge of remission ordained by him who is exalted a Prince and a Saviour to bestow reformation and remission of sins! If there was light in them, there was darkness in Peter and all the other Apostles, on this one question at least. If she asked the Pentecostian question, she ought certainly to have received the Pentecostian answer. But, alas! the anxious seats, the wooden altar, and the human priest appear alike intelligent on this all interesting subject in imparting instruction to the believing penitent how to obtain the testimony of a good conscience.

Ed. M. H.

Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence?

If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold thou art there.

If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea;

Even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me.

If I say, Surely the darkness shall cover me; even the night shall be light about me.

Yea, the darkness hideth not from thee; but the night shineth as the day: the darkness and the light are both alike to thee.

For thou hast possessed my reins: thou hast covered me in my mother's womb.

I will praise thee; for I am fearfully and wonderfully made: marvellous are thy works; and that my soul knoweth right well."

This was present with me wherever I went, and I was fully persuaded of its truth, as if it was written for me alone; and from that day to this it is seldom out of my mind. I am now an old man, 65 years of age, and the fear of God in my youthful days has kept me marvellously free from every vice calculated to destroy my constitution; so that I enjoy as good health now as many not half my years. Hence I lament the neglect of the Scriptures in families and schools.

Among the number immersed last week were several boys, none less than 14 years of age. Several of the brethren were concerned for them, and wished to know from themselves why they believed that Jesus was the Son of God. That question was asked by one of the brethren in the presence of several. "Why," replied the lad, "the Apostles have said Jesus raised the dead, gave sight to the blind, and healed the sick." All present were fully convinced the lad was a fit subject for immersion.

WM. CARMAN.

CHARLOTTESVILLE, Va. February 9th, 1834.

Brother Campbell,

WHILE in Washington I delivered a series of discourses to the Second Baptist Church in that city, on the subject of the proposed Reformation.—[This is the church to which I preached last summer, and where I immersed 16 believing penitents for the remission of their sins.] When I had done illustrating the nature, the necessity, and the design of the reformation for which we plead; they said—"Well, if this is C———ism, we are all C———ites in this church." Two old gentlemen, of more than ordinary intelligence, said to me, "When we see a church constituted on these principles, we will become members of it." The church is willing—yea, anxious to go into the Reformation, if they had a preacher able to sustain them. The last request they made of me was, if possible to persuade one to go there; and if I could not succeed, to request you to prevail on some one to make that city the field of his labors. But I told them, as much as we were persecuted by all the sects—if I may call their slanders and calumnies by that name—there were immense fields already ripe for harvest, into which we had as yet not put a sickle. O! that there were more intelligent, bold, and prudent laborers in the field—men who would take the sword of the Spirit in one hand and their life in the other, resolved never to yield the former without the latter!

I find many who would be reformers if they only had stamina and moral courage enough to forego the honors of the world and the applause of men, and to stem the torrent of opposition. This is a day to try men's souls.

On my way from Washington here, I spent 8 or 9 days in Fredericksburg, and delivered 9 discourses. Many persons belonging to the different sects attended, and it was believed much of their former prejudice was removed. The number and interest of the congregations gradually increased; and it was thought several persons would have obeyed the gospel, if I could have remained a few days longer. The night I left, just as the bell rang for 9 o'clock, in the presence of many spectators, I immersed a lady in the name of the Lord

Jesus, *in* the Rappahannoc, *into* the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The stillness of the night, and the profound silence that pervaded the congregation that lined the bank of the river—the dim light that reflected from the pale moon through the clouds that descended in a gentle shower of rain; all tended to heighten the interest and contribute to the solemnity of the scene. On the bank I bade my friends farewell, and the next morning found me many miles on my way to this place.

I have been here nearly three weeks, and have delivered 15 or 16 discourses in the Baptist meeting to unusually attentive congregations. I have, as far as I could, in so short a time, developed and illustrated the ancient gospel and ancient order of things. The people are so deeply interested in this great and important subject as to wade through mud and snow almost every night to hear more. So anxious are they to hear, that several evenings they had the bell rang without my consent or even knowledge. The zealous and active portion of the church are in favor of reformation. Several, who, not more than three weeks ago, severely reprimanded some of their friends for reading the Harbinger, now read it themselves, and express their astonishment and regret at their former prejudices. The state of things is materially changed.

Some of the very orthodox members of the church are not so favorable to the reformers' occupying the house. One acknowledges he could find no fault with my preaching, but said we produced disturbances wherever we go. "There will be no disturbance in this church," said the reformer, "on our part." If there be any at all, it will be produced by those opposed to reformation, as has invariably been the case throughout Eastern Virginia. They are already threatened with DECREES." Another of the orthodox members, the other day, when urged to point out an idea I had advanced which was not in the Bible, said, "The devil preached the truth to the Saviour!" Very true. But the Messiah did not keep silence to his face and slander him in his absence. No: he showed him wherein he had *wrested* the Scriptures, and corrected all his abuses of them. It might not be amiss to state that this same person not long since influenced some of the brethren to read the Millennial Harbinger. They have done so to advantage.

I am requested to say to all the evangelists and other preachers in the reformation, that the brethren here wish them to visit this place whenever they can make it convenient.

I have seen a letter in the Religious Herald, written by brother Howell of Norfolk, charging Dr. M'Call and myself with having acted under "a hypocritical disguise" in our preaching in his borough. How brother H. could make such a statement, is difficult to perceive. He certainly trusted to a "purblind theology" to help him out of the difficulty: a theology which will allow the use of any means for its support and advancement. He, no doubt, concluded as we would not be allowed to defend ourselves in the *Herald*, we could not repel his calumnies so as to correct him of his gross and palpable misrepresentation before the readers of that paper.

How brother M'Call acted while in Norfolk I am not prepared to say; but if we may judge of the whole of brother H's statement from a part, we must believe he has slandered him. He says, for instance, that Dr. M'C. acknowledged in a letter which you published a year ago in the Millennial Harbinger, that he had acted under a "hypocritical disguise." Now, Dr. M'C. does not make any such acknowledgment, as any one may see by reading the letter referred to.

I presume his *acting* in that way is just as true as his acknowledgment of it. But I doubt the correctness of his statement from another circumstance. The brethren in Norfolk whom I heard mention the name of Dr. M'C. spoke of him in the most exalted terms; which I would not suppose to be the case, had he acted as brother H. represents.

Not satisfied with calumniating Dr. M'C. brother H. must introduce my name in his ill-natured and abusive letter. Had not his temper been too high to admit of reflection, he certainly would not have committed himself as he

has done in what he says about me. He accuses me with the same kind of hypocrisy. I had letters stating that I was a Baptist. These brother H. read I informed him that I did not believe all the doctrines of the Baptists—that I was favorable to the reformation for which A. C. and others plead. When last in Norfolk several of the brethren told me that brother H. had informed them that I was so candid as to give this information. Should he have *forgotten* it, I am prepared to bring it to his recollection, or, at least, to make good my statement.

I preached the doctrine of the reformation in Norfolk, and I understood the church were delighted with it, until they were informed that what I preached were the same sentiments as those entertained by A. C. Another proof this that names rule the world. Men, not things, are the subjects of contention.

There are some of your violent enemies who are heaping upon you opprobrious epithets, and at the same time not only preach many of your sentiments, but are guilty of the most unjustifiable plagiarism from your writings—[brother H. himself, for example—see his Discourses on Baptism.] If we can credit the testimony of our eyes and ears, we are compelled to believe that many will arise to address a congregation, read their *text*, preface their discourse with a few abusive observations about you to prevent the people's thinking them C——ites, and proceed to inculcate the sentiments they have learned from your writings. And all this they seem to consider very honest too!

One of brother H's brethren has just remarked to me, that his letter in the Herald affords two proofs that the cause brother H. advocates is not the cause of God. One is, that it admits the violation of truth and every honorable principle, and requires for its support defamation and persecution—the adjuncts of a weak and wicked cause. The *second* is, that it has not made of its most devoted friend and zealou advocates a better man. "He is the worse for mending." There is no redeeming power in any of the systems of men. Their imbecility calls imperatively for reformation.

Instead of brother H. being opposed to 'C—ism,' as he calls the reformation, I think he should encourage it; for the brethren in Norfolk informed me it was under the preaching of Dr. M'C. that a great revival took place in his congregation. True, brother H. attributes it to his own labors; but it must not be forgotten that *his memory is very treacherous!*

N. B.—If the Editor of the Religious Herald is disposed to do me justice, as some of his brethren here think he is, he will please copy so much of this letter as relates to brother H's misrepresentation of my course.

B. F. HALL.

AFTER the usual process of committees and decress, the brethren in the vicinity of Victory, New York, had to commence for themselves.—*Ed. M. H.*

VICTORY, N. Y. January 24, 1834.

——"THE next morning we resumed our meeting, at the close of which eleven were immersed into the death of Jesus, and four more the next first day. The church consisted of about one hundred effective members, three-fourths of whom probably have embraced the ancient gospel, and will endeavor to restore the ancient order.

After the meeting brother Moss and myself, in company with brother Barnes, repaired to Victory, the place of my residence; and on Saturday we commenced a three day's meeting. Brethren Moss and Lowell were the principal speakers. Fifteen confessed the Lord, and were immersed during the meeting; among whom were my wife and eldest daughter, 15 years old; in view of which I say, Bless the Lord, O my soul, and forget not all his benefits! Two were immersed by brother Moss two weeks before. We shall probably bring off as many of the Regulars. The clergy are taking measures to stop the growing evil. The Methodists are shutting up their bowels of compassion, charging their classes to hold no union meetings. If other persuasions will come to their meetings, let them come; but the meeting must be Methodist.

The Baptists say efficient measures must be adopted to purge the church. Elder T——— of Ira, I am informed, says we make so much of baptism, that he is sick of it. One of his Deacons, the most efficient and able member in the church, has embraced the gospel; and a number more, say half a dozen at least, will soon be excluded.

Last Lord's day I immersed a willing disciple, who has been kept in bondage thirty years by the dark and unintelligible systems of human device, in view of the above facts, and many other circumstances unworthy of a place in this letter. We thank God and take courage.

JOHN M. BARTLETT.

POMPEY, Onondaga county, N. Y. February 12, 1834.

THE cause of the reformation triumphs in this county. Its most violent enemies are under its influence. Even the Clergy themselves already begin to talk about the "simplicity of the gospel," and would fain have their devoted followers believe that they have learned it from their own creeds! Nothing more for the present; but you shall hear from me on the progress of reform in a few weeks.

J. I. LOWELL.

LAWRENCEVILLE Ill. Jan. 25, 1834.

I TAKE the liberty to write a few lines to you concerning the progress of reform. I commenced preaching in this neighborhood last summer. Since that time I have immersed nine in this vicinity upon a confession of their faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

ANDREW BAIRD.

GARRETTSVILLE, Feb. 6, 1834.

Dearly Beloved,

I SHALL now give you a short account of one of the most desperate exertions that ever the Regular Baptists have made in this country. They appointed a protracted meeting in our village, to commence on the 16th of last month, and when the day had come there were five or six preachers who came on with Mr. Barnes of Jefferson, Ashtabula county, who was instrumental in excluding several of the best members of his church for reading the M. H. They commenced their meeting according to appointment, and the second or third day they appointed what they called an "inquiry meeting" in a school house in the evening; and as it was called an inquiry meeting I supposed that all inquirers would be welcome. I accordingly went with two other disciples; but soon found that I was not welcome. I, however, stayed till meeting was closed, which was done by praying for the Holy Spirit to be poured out on the anxious, and an exhortation to them not to let any errors that might be whispered into their ears quench their serious impressions. The meeting went on for seven days, commencing at sunrise with a prayer meeting, then a sermon as they called it, then another prayer meeting—at which time they fixed an anxious seat, and all the anxious were called forward and prayed for—then a sermon, then in the evening the same scene was acted again; and on the seventh day they called for the converts to come forward for baptism, when three came forward and were immersed after telling their experience and hearing the articles and covenant of the church read to them. The meeting then was continued one day more, which made eight days in succession. They then stopt one day to rest, and in the evening commenced again, and continued it two days and nights longer. They then dismissed as they said; but Mr. Barnes could not leave the place, but visited round from house to house for five days, holding meetings in the evenings, and then commenced another desperate attack on the sinners, and continued it for two days longer, and then closed the scene by preaching to the anxious from the 4th and 5th verses of the fifth chapter of Ecclesiastes, and then wished all that had ob-

tained a hope during this meeting to come forward, and twelve arose—and then he requested all the anxious that had not a hope to arise, and fifteen or twenty arose. I ought to have stated that the Presbyterians and Methodist united with them, and it seemed more like a Methodist camp meeting than as Regular Baptist meeting. For all this labor Mr. Barnes received only sixteen dollars which was collected from the sheep and the goats.

Yours in the Lord,

JOHN RUDULPH.

MT. VERNON, Ill. Jan. 24, 1834.

Brother Campbell,

I AM now nearly sixty years of age, and for the first time, I had the pleasure not long since of sleeping in the same bed with a Methodist circuit rider. Before we retired to bed, he went about prayer, and closed by saying we would spend eternity in praising Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and having no testimony of that fact I did not say, Amen. When we got to bed, (but that was not soon, for it took him some time to pay penance) I told him the reason why I did not say, 'So let it be.' This led to some conversation on the subject—when he observed the Jews baptized the Gentiles in the name of the Father, John in the name of the Son, and the Apostles in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. I asked him where that text of Scripture was, that told us the Jews baptized in the name of the Father previous to John's day. He observed he did not then recollect. I have since found it; but not in the Bible: it is in Clark's Commentary on the New Testament. I have heard the same man preach some two or three weeks before—he said a great deal about Solomon's Temple—spoke of the mercy seat, and the cherubims, of the high priest sprinkling the blood of the sacrifice on the mercy seat between the cherubims, this, he said, was a representation of the blood of Christ which was shed to unite his human and divine natures. Last summer I had the pleasure (if there was any) of hearing the Elder preach at a camp meeting near this place. He said God had neither body nor parts, and when Christ's human nature was offered in sacrifice, there was a little part of God left with him to keep him from putrefaction; and for the life of me I could not see how a something without body or parts could be divided into two or more parts. He also told us that when John baptized our Saviour he took him to the river Jodan and washed his hands and feet—this is the fourth mode of baptism. The Baptists in this country are dead, but not buried, and their preacher has gone to the province of Texas to sow his two seeds there, with a hope (I suppose) they will grow better in a warm climate. The pure testimony is cutting its way through, and cowards are leaving the field. The unregenerate are reading the New Testament and embracing the truth. I was at a meeting in Marion county last Sunday, and had the pleasure of seeing one of the young disciples step forward as a mouth for the Lord.

Query 1. Where is that text of Scripture recorded that commands men or angels to worship the Holy Ghost?

2. If Christ did possess two natures human and divine, which of his two natures did he ask his Father to glorify?

Yours in the hope of that good country,

J. BAUGH.

Answer to Query 1. In the Apocryphal books of the fathers. God now is worshipped acceptably only when worshipped through the Son, and by the Holy Spirit dwelling in our hearts. To pray or sing praises to the Holy Spirit within us, is as irrational as it is unscriptural. No Apostle, nor Prophet, nor Saint ever prayed to the Holy Spirit, or sung one of Dr. Watts' doxologies.

Answer to Query 2. This is an untaught question, and so extravagantly *sectarian* that it is unanswerable.

ED. M. H.

HARRISVILLE, *Harrison county, Ohio*, February 8, 1834.

THROUGH the goodness of him that "keeps Israel," I am now favored with another opportunity of writing to you. Several have become obedient to the faith in this section of country since my last communication. A great and effectual door is opened to me, yet there are many opposers. I find many in my travels who profess their *firm* belief in the existence of God, and in the same breath reject the revelation that he has given of himself! A deistical opponent of mine, in this county, has made some great and appalling discoveries recently. He thinks that in numbering the men of Israel—(see 2 Samuel xxiv.—compare 1 Chronicles xxi.) also, the number of the men of Judah, (*ib.*) likewise, the price paid for the threshing floor, &c. (*ib.*) there is a wide difference. He fears it will quite overset his *faith* in the revelation of God—though professing at the same time not to have any! Will you, sir, pay this a passing notice?

ROBERT COOK.

The sceptics in all ages have been most successful in finding irreconcilable difficulties, contradictions, &c. in the books of Numbers, Kings, and Chronicles, in the departments of *numerals*, *dates*, and the *names of places*. They proceed upon the hypothesis that the original inspiration of the authors ought to descend upon the copyists, translators, printers and publishers of these books; so that a printer could not lift up a wrong letter if he were even to attempt it! This is the pith and substance of all these difficulties. That such errors have occurred, and do now occur, no Christian of any sense will deny. The numeral letters of the Greeks and Hebrews are more easily mistaken, than *n* or *r*, a *g* or *q*, a *w* or *v*. Some of the Bible Society Bibles have left out whole verses. Professor Stuart, in the version of the single Epistle to the Romans, left out a verse. When manuscripts were scarce and expensive, it was not so easy to detect an error, nor to correct it as now. In the case of the oxen and threshing floor of Ornan, asnarrated in Sam. & Chron. In the former but the materials for the sacrifice and the threshing floor are purchased for 50 shekels of silver; and in the other the materials for the sacrifice and "*the place*," or the premises on which the Temple was built, were bought for six hundred shekels of gold. In the enumerating of Israel and Judah, it was a scene of confusion throughout. Joab did not like it—only did it partially—left out Levi and Benjamin, and either made two returns of the census, or the numerals were not copied accurately—in the one place or the other. But as a thousand typographical mistakes in one impression of the New Testament, does not impair its credibility, neither can the error of a copyist in a date or in the mistake of a numeral letter.——*Ed. M. H.*

Messrs. Brantly and Ballantine.

THE piece from the *Religious Narrator* of Philadelphia, published in our last number, has elicited a pamphlet of 40 pages from our venerable and amiable brother *Ballantine*. I am sorry that our limits prevent us from making more liberal extracts from this masterly production. It is one of the best written pamphlets which our opponents have forced into existence since the present controversy began, and in the most clear and convincing manner contrasts the Baptist church as it now stands before the public, with the primitive church as set in order by the Apostles. We recommend the perusal of it to both sides of

this controversy, and shall only give a few of the last paragraphs as a sample of the good spirit and good sense with which it abounds:—

"Again you object that we are the turners of the religious world upside down. "Many" (you say) "of the Baptist churches in Virginia, Kentucky, and Ohio, have been infested and distracted with the spirit of innovation attendant upon the efforts of these professed restorers of the ancient gospel." Blessed be the Lord of hosts for this voice of triumph from the lips of an enemy! But the Baptist churches have been distracted. This is the voice of a sect. Why not condole with the distractions of the Methodists, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, &c.? Infested and distracted with what? The ancient gospel, baptism for the remission of sins, the gift of the Holy Spirit, the keeping of the commandments of Christ as delivered by the holy Apostles, the life and power of true godliness. Just as it ought to be. "Let God be true, but every man a liar." Let the name of every sect be blown to the four winds. For "there is no other name under heaven given among men but the name Jesus, whereby we can be saved." And let all the believers in all your corrupt churches come out from among them, that they may worship "the Father in spirit, rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh." This is just what it ought to be. Our Master says, "From such as have a form of godliness, but deny its power, turn away." 2 Tim. iii. 5. And when throwing all your Babylonish rubbish into one heap, his command is, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plages." Rev. xviii. 4. It will be a great pity, and greatly to the disgrace of the brethren in your Babylon, if they allow you to traverse this command, as you threaten to put away from you those to whom the command is given. "Come out of her my people." Upon the whole of this accusation you form against us, we say it is well. Let all those who believe, and act upon the ancient gospel, leave all "your tents," "touch not the unclean thing," and give you leave to do all you can with your modern gospel and all its adjuncts and appendages.

We are again accused of "a late attempt to enlighten Philadelphia on the claims and pretensions of the ancient gospel." It is true, our beloved brother Campbell has visited us. You may call his visit by what name you please. We will take your own phraseology: "An attempt to enlighten Philadelphia." And certainly your attempt to asperse both him and us, shows the necessity of such an attempt, so far as it respects you and your abettors. He was with us many days, teaching the way of the Lord, by building up the Christians in their holy faith, pointing unbelieving men to the only refuge set before them in the gospel, and even contending with all the sceptics found in our borders, for "the faith once delivered to the saints," and you never, for once, attempted to face him in a conference either on ancient or modern gospel, although he preached for you once, to my knowledge, in Camdem, New Jersey. Now, when he is removed from us, you talk of his late attempt. Could not you have seen him and talked over this attempt, and pointed out to him what was improper in his

attempt? This would have been, at least, what men call manly—but your hiding yourself from him while here, (we shall not use the term *skulking*,) and then barking at him when he is gone———. You may make out the sentence by what words you please. You then endeavor to asperse our beloved brother Campbell by some loose and evasive inuendoes. "These Baptists," you say, "who have put themselves in the way of the" [late] "illumination have been gravely informed that they are wholly in error, that they are gulled and cheated by their designing and mercenary pastors, who perpetuate the deception only that they may continue to enjoy their salaries, and make a gain of the Lord's congregations." Who ever heard our brother say such things, in all his speeches among us? Like a wise teacher of Christianity he did something else, and had something else to do. To build up believers in the divine truth, and to commend that "truth to every man's conscience, in the sight of God," was the burden of his administrations among us. But associations of ideas often betray the real sentiments of men. You have some crude idea of what brother Campbell would teach! You know his teaching is directly opposed to priestcraft, and consequently to the salaries of priests; and as your priesthood and the salary of that priesthood must be dear to you, you cry out, "Our craft is in danger! Away with such a fellow from the earth!" This, therefore, that you attribute to brother Campbell is the association of your ideas, the frightful imagery of your own brain. If you give us again another opportunity of answering your false assertions, your invidious inuendoes, we may scatter a few more rays of light on your priesthood, and its price, without at all implicating our brother Campbell.

We are altogether at a loss whom you mean, "who wipe their feet upon your carpets—tread upon your pride, and escape detection." But if you wish to know how priests ought to decorate themselves with carpets, &c. you may read the Third Epistle of Peter, which you will find in the Christian Baptist.

You have no doubt "the restorers of the ancient gospel have infused a bad leaven into some of our churches." Nor have we any doubt of it. Jesus compares the word of his kingdom to leaven, which a woman takes and hides in so many measures of meal, till the whole is leavened.

We hope, as you say, there is good sense enough in your communities to see through such flimsy pretences. We are happy to hear you appeal to good sense. We are well assured, if your communities were to use their good sense, your modern gospel and all its effects would be scouted from your communities, and the ancient gospel with all its ordinances would have free course and be glorified.

In the close of your aspersions, you strut indeed like a true son of Babylon. You say we must be "suppressed and exterminated" by that power with which Christ has clothed his church, and that is the power of censure and expulsion. O, dreadful! All the horrors of the Inquisition start into view! We bless our heavenly Father, that these threats, by his good Providence, pass by us as the idle wind.

Come, now, lay aside all these lofty imaginations, and let us reason together, in all the benevolence of the gospel of the blessed God. You talk of "censure." Censure on whom? "Expulsion!" Of whom? What are we saying? What are we doing? Now be calm, dispassionate, "full of good fruits." Are we saying any thing than what Christ and his Apostles said? And what are our exertions among our fellow-men? All are witnesses who know us, of our sayings and doings, that we are seeking the temporal, spiritual, and eternal welfare of our fellow-men; that they may love God, who gave his Son to die for them; that they believe and obey Jesus Christ as their Saviour, their Lord and Master; that they resist not the Holy Spirit, the great administrator in the gospel kingdom; that they be immersed into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit for the remission of their sins; that they observe all the Lord's commandments and ordinances; hat they come out from all the wickedness that is in the world through lust; that they love one another as brethren in Christ; that they show all benevolence and kindness to their fellow-men; be good husbands; good wives; wise and kind parents; obedient children, &c. &c. In a word, that all under our influence be taught, by "the grace of God, that hath appeared unto all men, bringing salvation, to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, to live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present evil world, looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God, even our Saviour Jesus Christ." Titus ii. 11—13. Is it for these things, then, we are to be "censured and excluded?" We are truly ashamed of your ignorance and insolence. You, at least, might have the good sense of Gamaliel, to say, "Let these men alone." No, you say, it is not for these things we censure and would exclude you; it is because you give yourselves out as no sect—condemn all sects—have no confession of faith—condemn those that have—find fault with all our great reformers—pretend to know more than all the great Divines that have gone before! And "that you are a confident, assuming, and self-sufficient people, boldly, and clamorously, condemning the opinions of all those who maintain the Spirit's influence in regeneration, and who decline the observance of our pretended apostolic order." Time will not now allow us to dissect all this ignorant and malevolent rhapsody.

But we are forcibly reminded of that part of the gospel history, when the Jews took up stones again, to stone to death our blessed Master, he answered, "Many good works have I showed you from my Father: for which of these works do you stone me? The Jews answered him, saying, For a good work we stone you not; but for blasphemy." John x. 32, 33. It falls to the Jews and to you, to say wherein the blasphemy of Jesus, and our blasphemy consists. Do this fairly, as men of honesty and common sense, before you speak of "censure and exclusion." We are ready to meet your explication of our blasphemy, upon the unsophisticated principle of right reason and common sense. We wish you to do this for you own sakes, that you may not cheat yonrselves out of the knowledge and faith of our Lord

Jesus Christ. As for us, your "censures and exclusions" will do us no harm. They shall be piled up in the Vatican, among the archives of the Mother of Harlots, and be brought forth in the day when every man shall be judged according to his works. To this day we look in every word we now address to you. Nor have we written one word but that which is dictated by the pure philanthropy which the gospel breathes. Sorry we are to find fault. It would fill us with the most extatic joy to see all your churches filled with the happiness and joy of the ancient gospel, and you consequently "walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord Jesus." But if you insist that this cannot—will not be the case, we turn to our heavenly Father, and to Jesus, the head of his people, and pray earnestly that all they, who, in your corrupt communities, have the spirit of Jesus, may immediately hear the heavenly voice—"From such turn away,"—"Come out of her, my people." And we earnestly entreat the same throne of grace, that all the people of God among you may not abide your "censure," nor your "expulsion," but add to their "faith, fortitude," and dare to "contend for the faith once delivered to the saints, in good and bad report," that they may give such a delineation of the power of the ancient gospel that they may constrain worldly people among whom they dwell, "to believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God." We beg if you do not yield to the truth, your further aspersions on our faith and conduct, as we are confident that they will tend to the further elucidation of "the truth as it is in Jesus." And believe us to be your best friends, in the hope of immortality."

Hearing by the Soul, and hearing by the Ear.

THE following pieces—(the one from the *Christian Palladium*, written by a New York editor and preacher; the latter from a Philadelphia correspondent to the *Philadelphia Liberalist*)—show that the ears of the teachers of religious theories are in their souls when their views are opposed; but on their heads when their views are defended and approved. I do not impute to either of these gentlemen any unworthy motive in any of the censures which they express, more than in the approbation which they confer on my labors in their respective cities. I do not doubt, in the least, their sincerity, honesty, or good intentions. If they heard what I never uttered, and report the sounds which reached their souls rather than those which I expressed, it is because of this peculiar mode of hearing, which has succeeded that distressing "itch in the ear" which Paul foretold in one of his last epistles. Men both see and hear now-a-days, not only without eyes and ears, but contrary to the testimony of both. I, therefore, knowing in some degree the signs of the times, can appreciate the real causes of these unpropitious hallucinations which beguile men of the best discernment in other things, and of the most honorable designs in all their approaches to men. They shall now be *heard* according to what they have spoken:—

From the Christian Palladium, of February, 1834.

From our New York correspondent, under date of December 12, 1833.

Dear Sir—Mr. Campbell has recently visited our city. He left here yesterday, for his residence in Virginia, by the way of Philadelphia. He will spend some time in Philadelphia on his return. He spent about ten days with us, and delivered ten discourses. Two topics engrossed all his attention; they were the *summum bonum* of all his discourses, the "divine original of Christianity," and the "doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins." He spent some time at my house, and I was with him a considerable of the time while here. Mr. Campbell is a man of strong mind, retentive memory, and is an original genius. He is well calculated to address a popular assembly, by his readiness of communication, and great plainness of speech. He attracts the attention of the better informed of the community, by his cogent reasoning, and the rich fund and variety of interesting matter which he pours forth in his discourses. He attracted considerable attention here, and, had he staid longer, would have called forth much more.

His three discourses against Infidelity, were delivered at Concert and Tammany Halls. These places are occupied by the Infidels on the Sabbath day. He treated them with much courtesy, but handled their arguments with much adroitness. His reasoning in favor of CHRISTIANITY was unanswerable; and his exposure of the sophistry and inconsistency of *Infidelity* was highly amusing; and he has proved himself to be altogether a superior man.

With respect to his remarks on the doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins, he offered nothing new; having exhausted that subject in his Extras. He intends to spend the next season in this state. He will commence at this city, and pass up through it. He wishes to set the ball rolling in the great state of New York. Dr. Barker of this city, who ministers to a small congregation in Laurens street, and to which the C——ites are principally attached, has, I understand, entered into his views, and from henceforth will be a reformer.

I conversed with Mr. Campbell about four hours on his favorite topic, not so much by the way of argument, as inquiry. I found him very lame on some points, and made him own it. He assigns as a reason for not answering my *Numbers* in reply to him, that he thought I was a young writer, and that, if let alone, I would gradually come over to his views; so let me pass. PETER.

—

As to "the two topics" of my friend PETER—my *summum bonum*—the truth of Christianity, and the remission of sins—they are certainly worth ten discourses, of the very highest order. God and man are but *two topics;* and enough for man to know. The Old Testament and the New are but *two topics.* Eternal life and eternal death are but *two topics* also. But I am not so certain that I deserve to be praised for having spent ten discourses on but two topics. My notes on my visit to New York will show my topics in that city; and if the

reader can make just these two out of them, he is a logician of the *genus generalissimum*. I did not deliver one discourse, according to my five senses, on "baptism for the remission of sins;" yet I have no doubt but the gentleman heard seven from me on that one topic—that is, by the *internal sense of hearing*.

The gentleman found that I *halted*, or was crippled in one leg; or, rather, on one topic, and that I owned that I had been disabled in that limb. 'On some points he found me rather lame;' but still after four hours I could stand alone! Raillery apart, I should be glad to hear, through the medium of the *Palladium*, something more about this *lameness*, and to have from the *Doctor* a receipt for its cure. I hope he will, like my friend Hinton, give me a lecture upon the *pathology of intellectual limping*. EDITOR.

From the Liberalist, of December 28, 1833.

REV. ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.

This gentleman is now actively engaged among us in the defence of Divine Revelation. His great knowledge of the subject, and his extraordinary talents as a public speaker, eminently qualify him for the office to which he is so ardently devoted. All who have any doubts of the divine origin of Christianity, and who wish to be fully persuaded in their own minds, should by all means embrace the present opportunity for hearing Mr. Campbell. On this subject he is perfectly irresistible.

At the same time, we are free to confess, that it would be more agreeable to our feelings and views, if Mr. C. would confine himself rather to the *truth* than to the *doctrines* of Christianity. After he had very successfully rebuked the spirit of sectarianism, we were not prepared to hear quite so much in support of his *own views* of religion and it was with some surprise that we heard him limit the salvation of human beings to those who believed as he did. We had conceived of Mr. C. as a very liberal Christian; and we were therefore sorry to hear him assert that "without immersion and an inward assurance that God had actually pardoned him, *no man's soul could be saved!*" On what authority Mr. C. has set up this standard by which he judges ALL men, whether they are Christians or not, whether they ever heard of God or not, we cannot tell. We presume that there are few sectarians who limit human salvation to a narrower compass than this.

During his discourse, Mr. C. remarked that there is in the Christian world a great deal of zeal, "but not according to knowledge." When this remark was made, we did not expect that he would illustrate the truth of it himself, so immediately. Of Mr. Campbell's honesty and sincerity there can be no doubt; but when he called upon all who believed in Jesus Christ as a messenger from heaven, *to make public profession of it*, in the way he thought fit to dictate, at the peril of being denounced as rejectors of Christ, he offered a direct insult to every modest and unassuming Christian. Does Mr. C. think that taking *him* by the hand, before a public assembly, will constitute

either a man or woman a Christian? Or does he know so little of human nature as to suppose that those who shaked hands with him were *more* pious or *more* virtuous than those who declined? We are unwilling to call Mr. C. a fanatic; but we seriously ask, whether there is not something FANATICAL in such conduct—particularly when it was followed with the remark (something very like a threat) that he should know how to treat them when he met themagain?

We are sorry that we are compelled to make these remarks: they are offered much more in sorrow than in anger. If they should meet the eye of Mr. C. we hope he will receive them in that spirit of kindness with which they are offered. We give him great credit for his arduous labors; and, as the advocate for the divine authenticity of Christianity, we wish him God speed. S.

Touching my friend S. of the *Liberalist*, his internal sense of hearing is more acute than that of my friend Peter; for he can hear at a hundred miles distance that which other persons cannot hear at the distance of ten yards. I agree with him, however, that *shaking hands* is no proof of either piety or virtue, and as such I never before heard it urged—and certainly never stipulated for such a sign.

But to reciprocate the sorrow and good feelings of my friend S., I would say, it gives me great sorrow to see a person of his sense esteeming it *fanaticism* to teach the people that obedience to any command is necessary to salvation! If obedience be at all necessary, the item or items, the quantity or quality is easily ascertained; and if any difference exist, it is about quantity. But if he holds that *disobedience* leads to eternal life as certainly as *obedience*, then indeed he may imagine that all are somewhat "fanatical" who limit salvation only to such as are obedient to the Captain of Salvation.

EDITOR.

QUERIES.

2. OUGHT the whole loaf to be entirely eaten by the disciples?

Answer. They are no where commanded to eat it all; nor is there any example, hint, or allusion in the sacred books known to us, intimating that it ought to be all eaten in order to complete the celebration, or to perfect the symbolic import of the institution. Indeed, such an effort would be accompanied with no little inconvenience and impropriety; and would rather misrepresent than represent the truth. The remainder rather shows how many more might feast upon the sacrifice of Christ—that yet there is room. Again, if the whole loaf should be eat, the whole cup of wine should be drunk; and who can adjust matters so exactly as to have just enough, without going round and round time after time? Such minutia is unworthy of the Christian institution.

3. Is not a member of a church a heretic, who says, "If you do not exclude that man," or, "If you do not thus and so, I will withdraw from the church"?

Answer. A heretic is a schismatic—one who makes division, and not one who errs in judgment, or who is simply dogmatical and overbearing. I would rather call such a person a *despot*, a dictator, and proceed to teach him the way of the Lord more perfectly. The Spirit of Christ speaks not on this wise, 'Lord, if you do not cast that man out of heaven, I wish you would cast me out.' It rather says, 'Lord, grant that I may save and reclaim my erring brother, lest he should be destroyed in the day of thy just retribution!'

4. What should the church do with a healthy young brother, living two or three miles from the meeting-house, who attends only once in two or three months?

Answer. Go to his house, and teach and admonish him; appoint meetings for prayer and praise at his residence; and soften his heart by the sympathies and love of the brethren. When you rub iron with a magnet, it will receive and communicate the power of attraction. Apply the magnet of heavenly love to the hearts of the brethren, and let them come into contact with such a brother, and he will be drawn to his duty, and to them who are drawn to Jesus by the attractive power of his love. Such a course will certainly melt the heart of a brother, and stir him up to his duty; or, if he be not a brother in reality, it will drive him to such an excess of folly as to make him manifest, and expose him to exclusion on other accounts than simple lukewarmness.

5. Is it legal for a proclaimer of the ancient faith to celebrate the rites of matrimony? If not *legal* for him, what legalizes the act on the part of "the orthodox?" J. A. B. *Alabama.*

Answer. Marriage under our government is a *political* as well as a *religious* institution. The different states have enacted laws upon this subject, and authorized certain persons to celebrate the rites of matrimony. When marriage is contracted and celebrated according to these laws, it is legal as respects the state, and religious as respects the Christian institution, and to be approbated by the church of God. The laws of all the states, as far as known to me, authorize such marriage rites as are consistent with the genius of our religion. And if these laws appoint a civil magistrate, or a minister of any religious sect, or a proclaimer of the ancient faith to celebrate the rites of matrimony, it is every way consistent and expedient that such persons attend upon this service as *ministers of the body politic.* As members or servants of the church, they have no *political right* to celebrate these rites; and the church has no necessity to appoint persons for such a service, as the state has taken it under its jurisdiction. If the state authorizes any one whom the church ordains to office to do this service, neither the congregation nor the state, as far as I know, have any reason to object, either on the ground of political or religious privilege.

6. Is it consistent with reason or good sense for one of the sect of proclaimers, or 'preachers,' to admonish his brethren to read or search the Scriptures, when, at the same time, they are denied any conclusion or opinion other than those found in his "Confession of Faith," which is not the conclusion of his, or their own reading? Or should they take

his advice, and form different views than those of his creed, would they not subject themselves to the anathema of their church?

J. A. B.—*Alabama.*

Answer. It is altogether ridiculous and absurd to exhort a person to search the Scriptures for himself, unless he be allowed to form and entertain his own conclusions without censure or expulsion because of his opinions and reasonings. To allow and entreat persons to examine for themselves, and to expel or censure them for thinking for themselves, reminds me of a certain military chieftain who wished to appear very reasonable and equitable in issuing his orders. On one occasion he had some important service to accomplish, somewhat hazardous and adventurous. He called up his troops, and thus addressed them:—"Soldiers, your country has important duties for you to perform. It has placed you under my command. This authority I wish to exercise with all republican virtue. I wish you, therefore, fellow-soldiers, to have the most perfect freedom in every act of your obedience to my orders. Now as this is an arduous service which I require of you, I wish you to act like volunteers; and I, therefore, give you an opportunity of deciding for yourselves whether you will hazard all that the crisis requires. It is my wish to allow you the most perfect liberty of choice. You have it now, companions in arms. Say what you will do; only remember that he who refuses to accompany me and to do his duty, shall be brought up and shot without benefit of court martial or clergy!" This is tantamount to the case which you suggest, and so apposite as to fit at every corner. He that misunderstands this, could not be enlightened by any thing I could say.

7. When our first parents rebelled against the first institution of Heaven, were they not deprived of a *direct* and *infallible* intercourse with Jehovah, and given up for a time to their own delusions?

8. When the ancient Fathers corrupted the patriarchal religion, were they not deprived of the *inspiration* of God and suffered to walk in their own ways?

9. When the Jews corrupted the old covenant, was not the Holy Spirit of wisdom withdrawn until the God of Israel began to usher in a new dispensation?

10. Were not spiritual gifts continued in the primitive church until the mystery of iniquity corrupted the new institution?

11. Did our Saviour, the Apostles, or any Christian Prophet ever say that these gifts would ever be unnecessary in time?

12. If the above questions contain unquestionable facts, how will the ancient order of things be restored without the restoration of spiritual gifts? J. J. T.—*Georgia.*

Answer. We respond to these six queries, as they all tend to one point, in one general answer.

When man or angel apostatizes from any institution under which God has placed him, he is necessarily cut off from all communion and friendly intercourse with God, and can never return to God by that institution from which he has apostatized. This is the reason

why apostacy from Christ is unpardonable, and without hope: for to him who renounces Jesus as the Messiah, having once acknowledged him, there remains no new institution, no new sacrifice for sins—nothing but "a dreadful expectation of judgment, and a fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries."

In the economy of Heaven salvation from the penalties of rebellion against any one institution has been bestowed through a new institution. The instances you have mentioned are to this point. Adam returned not to God by that institution against which he rebelled. Neither did the Patriarchs nor the Jews. In the government of angels, for reasons unknown to mortal man, there is but one institution. Hence salvation to the rebel angels is impossible. "He took not hold of the angels that sinned, but confined them in Tartarus to the judgment of the great day."

Your 4th and 5th questions (made the 10th and 11th in our enumeration) look towards another point. It is not certain when spiritual gifts ceased. It appears from all antiquity that they did not cease in one day. Those who received them continued to exercise and enjoy them so long as they lived. Their cessation seems not to have been the consequence of the mystery of iniquity, but previous to its development. They were to cease, as Paul says, when certain purposes were achieved—"Prophecies shall be out of use, foreign tongues shall cease, science shall be abolished." So, also, Hebrews ii. 4 and 5. These gifts were for the confirmation of the gospel; and when that was confirmed there was no farther need for them.

For the infancy of the Christian institution these gifts were indispensable: but for its manhood they are as unnecessary as a guardian and a guide for one of mature age and reason. The Christian Scriptures close with an intimation that nothing is to be added by any spirit till the Lord come. Therefore, all who expect the restoration of spiritual gifts before the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven, are liable to all delusion; and in every age this notion has consequently resulted in fanaticism and the grossest delusions. We have no Elijah promised before the second coming of the Lord, as the Jews had before his first coming. The testimony was completed, and the law perfected by the disciples of the Messiah, as Isaiah foretold. Therefore the aged Apostles Peter, Jude, John, and Paul concur in exhorting Christians to continue steadfast in the Apostles' doctrine—to keep the commandments of the Apostles—to take heed to the prophetic word confirmed as to a light that shines in a dark place, till the day dawn, and the day-star arise in their hearts. We have no reason, therefore, to expect the restorntion of spiritual gifts, before the return of the Saviour.

13. What acceptation has the word *regeneration* in your writings?

MANY.

Answer. We are obliged to use certain words of extensive currency in the present day, sometimes in the popular sense, and sometimes in the biblical import. Our late Extra on Regeneration sets this matter fully before the public. This word is found but twice in the New Testament, and only once in reference to a personal change of state—then it refers to the washing of the new birth, or to immersion. But moral regeneration with us, as with all others, is sometimes used to designate that entire change of heart and life which constitutes a new creature. See Extra on Regeneration.

14. What are the churches to do with those persons who visit them without any letters of recommendation?

Answer. In all cases where they are not known to the brethren to be of good character, they ought not to be received—especially such strangers as profess to be proclaimers of the word. Many are now going to and fro of bankrupt reputation, and some who never had any reputation to lose, and they pass themselves off upon the well disposed as laborers in the cause of reformation.

We shall have to make out a list of certain persons of this class, whose evil deeds have come to our ears, if they persist in imposing upon the brethren.

We know of a few who are preaching upon their own responsibility. We think it necessary that the brethren should be also informed of all these cases as far as they are known to us.

We do not like to hold up any person to public reprobation; but the cause of righteousness requires that we should expose some of this class, unless they reform. EDITOR.

ELDERS GREEN AND HOWARD.

WE are in duty bound to publish the following statement, coming to us from a congregation of disciples. The statement published some time since came to us from an individual who might have been deceived. ED. M. H.

WE unanimously and jointly agree in certifying, that Elder Benjamin Howard came into this place in April last from Rochester, well recommended with letters from several churches, certifying his character to be unimpeachable. He commenced preaching the ancient gospel, and declared himself to be a disciple decidedly in sentiment with Alexander Campbell. The signs of reformation visibly appeared, which raised the indignation of some of the sectarians. The people that call themselves Christians, in a special manner, opposed him. One of their preachers, Thomas Medire, wrote a letter to Joseph Badger, the editor of the Palladium, in the following words—"Benjamin Howard has made his appearance here, and has gone to preaching; and inasmuch as you have driven him into Canada, I want you should come over and drive him back again." Mr. Badger obeyed the call, and soon commenced: but failed of success. B. Howard then wrote to Rochester for Elder Green, another proclaimer of the ancient gospel, to come to his assistance. He soon arrived, and brought with him a number of letters to confirm Elder Howard's character to be good. One of the letters was signed by Giles H. Holdin, Esq. a close Baptist, David Holdin, custom house officer, Fredrick Bushnell, president of the Monroe Bank, George C. Latta, a merchant—all men well known in this country. This opened the way, and the reformation broke out, and has taken a general spread in this place; and the said Green and Howard have baptized between seventy and eighty. The prospects in this country are as good now as they ever have been.

Moreover, Elder Wm. Scranton and Wm. Hunter came over from Rochester and attended a general meeting in this place, which meeting we see noticed in the Harbinger. Elder Scranton we understand is an agent for your paper. He stated that B. Howard's character was good in the country where Howard came from. We confess that we felt much wounded to see a piece in the Harbinger, signed by J. Ash, jun. against Elder Howard, concerning a man that was opposed to th baptism of his wife, which piece we do certify contains a number of errors. And we are certain that if the editor had known this, he never would have published them. We further certify that we know that J. Ash is decidedly opposed to some of the sentiments and doctrines which you teach, and so are many of his brethren in this country. We acknowledge that we were disappointed in the character of the people that call themselves Christians in this country, to see the spirit they manifest towards the disciples, and especially towards Elders Green and Howard—men that came here well recommended, and have sustained good characters ever since they have been here—whose labors have been blessed of God.

Done for and in behalf of the church of Christ in Hamilton, U. C. five miles from Coburg, December 1, 1833, at a public meeting on the first day of the week.

The above number was baptized in the course of three months. The opposition also from the Methodists has been almost unparallelled in this country.

GEORGE GROSVENOR, *Clerk.*

"A NEW Hebrew and English critical and pronouncing Dictionary, containing all the words in the Holy Bible, Hebrew and Chaldee, with the vowel points, prefixes, suffixes, or affixes, as they stand in the original text: together with their derivation, etymology, literal and spiritual meaning, and the texts where each word occurs—by W. L. Roy.

"This Dictionary will possess advantages superior to any heretofore published. It will contain a pure standard of pronunciation, which has been adopted by the most learned Jews throughout every part of the world, and especially in Jerusalem and Judea. It will be of the utmost importance to a Missionary going to the East.

"*Conditions*:—The work will be put to press when a sufficient number of subscribers are obtained to defray the expense. It will be printed on good paper, in 4to. or royal 8vo. form, with elegant new Hebrew type;—it will contain from six to eight hundred pages, and be delivered in boards, to subscribers at the low price of $10,00; the price to non-subscribers will be $15,00."

*As I know not by what *spirit* Mr. Roy discovers the *spiritual* meaning of the words, I cannot say much for that; but from my own acquaintance with the gentleman in my late tour to New York, and from the sheets which I examined of this work, I doubt not that it will be a work of general utility to all who wish an acquainrance with the Hebrew language. The author is, in my judgment, one of the best Hebrew scholars in our country. *Ed. M. H.*

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Number IV.——Volume V.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Bethany, Va. April, 1834.

Signs of the Times.

[CONTINUED.]

Watchmen, what of the night? I hear no report—the barbingers are seen, and the watch asleep. What can awake them? I address them not—'tis useless. They sleep. What is to break their fatal slumber? Nothing but "a great sound of the trumpet." Nothing but a burst of light from the worlds above; the grand procession; the myriads of his saints and angels; illuminating our horizon with heaven's splendor, and peopling it with countless legions; coming in the clouds of heaven, "every eye shall see him." This, only this, is to break the enchantment, the fatal, fatal spell.

I challenge their contradiction on the subject, the whole array of their strength, their boasted talents and learning, to show that just such a scene is not to take place at the introduction of Christ's universal reign. That the nations are not to be marshalled before his tribunal; that a judgment is not to sit; that he "whom the heaven must receive until the times of the restitution of all things"—is not to come in "like manner" as he went away; that he is not to plant his footsteps again on the Mount of Olives, a thousand years before the close of time.

They surely can make these things look unfeasible, or unworthy of their attention. Can put to silence illiterate common sense, or show that the time is so far distant, that all investigation is premature, or that no certain conclusions can be drawn from the sayings of the prophecies—that ambiguity, shades, and darkness, rest on the sacred pages—that time alone can develope the sayings of the prophets. That, notwithstanding God has pronounced, "Blessed is he that keepeth the sayings of the prophecy of this book," yet, at the same time, the sayings of prophecy was not intended to be known, and entirely beyond the ken of mortals.

They surely can show that the priest alone can know these things —that they have the keys of knowledge, as well as the "keys of the kingdom of heaven," as they affirm. They ought at least to give some token of their divine appointment. This was very common with the "specially called and sent" of old. Although facts are against the distant hope of evangelizing the world, they should show that it is possible, notwithstanding crime is on the increase, and the population of the heathen world gaining on their success in making converts, a thousand fold, more than ten times told. They should prove fairly to the thousands whose eternal destiny will be fixed by their council, that God is to pour out his spirit, (and we may safely wait for it) instead of the vials of his wrath; that the day of his wrath is not at hand; nor will it take place before the final judgment, and then the *earth*, with the finally impenitent, are to be the objects of his fiery indignation; that the meaning of prophecy may be known or unknown, and we equally safe; that peace and safety await the world, instead of pestilence and war; that the management of God's heritage till the end of time, is committed into their hands as their successors; that human wisdom may legislate in the house of its Creator, "in the temple of God;" that the laws of erring men may supercede, may be preferred, may better the harmony of the Master's household, than his own simple, pure, and heavenly law: that rules of faith, creeds, confessions, books of discipline, &c. may be adopted to govern God's people; that those mighty fabrics of human weakness, wickedness, and presumption may divide, scatter, alienate, and set at variance the followers of the meek and lowly Saviour, and their makers and supporters escape when the Lord ariseth to "shake terribly the earth."

From the pulpit we are often admonished to a strict observance of duty—this they prescribe, but rarely urge the most important duty man owes his God, reading and searching the scriptures. Can man know his duty from the pulpit amidst the endless jargon, the confusion of tongues in the religious world? Impossible! What an argument for reading the sacred book! But this is done for us, and a stipulation in filthy lucre is given for the proxy reading. The Bible is read by proxy, and nine-tenths of religious worship done and performed in the Christian world, is a proxy business. A man's presence is barely necessary at church to know, see, and hear that his priest does his worship for him. He then can live six days content, and, perhaps, does not open the lids of the sacred book. Alas! how little is God worshipped, known, feared, loved, or obeyed. "When the Son of Man cometh will he find faith on the earth."

He who loves his God, loves and consults his word; nor does a lover of God's word find *non-essentials* upon its pages. Yet, our teachers have found *non-essentials* among the Master's commands in God's word!! They may be interrogated before long. How have they "perverted the words of the living God, of the Lord of hosts our God!" "For the leaders of this people cause them to err; and they that are led of them are destroyed." "They follow their own spirit, and prophesy out of their own heart."

Feelings, a rule of right and wrong. The working of their own mind is taken for, and palmed on the credulous world, for supernatural operations of the Holy Spirit. And the sacred word of the living God is but a second on the throne in competition with the "SPIRIT," the inward working of a self-taught priest. "When Christ who is our life shall appear, the present will prove an age of gross darkness between being taught by the *Spirit*, and the fear of the Lord being taught "by the principles of men."

My apology for so frequently assailing the clergy, will mend the matter but little: it is this, They have been indubitably misapplying the prophecies. Why not precepts too? They have but one infallible rule; yet have they made hundreds. They are teaching opposites and endless diversities. Opposites cant be right. Among them there must be much error; yet they are all conscious of being right—all infallible—all condemned—all condemning; and until they can meet and unite as Christians, dispose of their antipathies and errors, reciprocate brotherly affection as members of the same family, teach one gospel, one way to heaven, "one faith, one Lord, one baptism"—until this be done, I have not done them injustice.

There is much strife and division in the Christian world; this I attribute to false teaching. Crime and infidelity are on an alarming increase; this I charge on the pulpit. Truth taught right would be believed right, and obeyed right, and would have the same happy effect that it had in the Apostles' days. Truth wrongly taught will be believed and obeyed wrong, and, of course, would produce the floods of error which we see in the Christian world. The Jewish priests led the nation to ruin. The typical gospel by their hands was managed to its undoing. The analogy must be carried out to its legitimate issue; if the one be a type, the other an antitype. Who will dare to deny this? Who, admitting it, can be at a loss to know how the dreadful analogy will end?

I see no room to hope for but a partial reformation. A few will be plucked, like brands from the burning, before the days of vengeance; "For, behold! the Lord will come with fire, and with his chariots like a whirlwind, to render his anger with fury, and his rebuke with flames of fire; for by fire and by his sword will the Lord plead with all flesh; and the slain of the Lord shall be many."

By false teaching the eastern world, where the religion of Christ was first taught, scarcely at this time presents a vestige of the Christian religion. By false teaching has the Catholic church "become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and the cage of every unclean and hateful bird. For all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication." *All nations!* Who is exempt? Do our teachers believe this allegation; made by the voice of inspiration? I answer, No. Can the nations drink of the wine of Babylon and not be drunken? Drunkenness and error are inseparably connected. A drunkard, take spiritual or temporal, and he is farther from the voice of reason, than any other man on earth. Our teacher may tell us that the gospel in the old world is

proving a savour of death—it has been abused and rejected. This will prove too much; it is impossible for the gospel to become a savour of life after it has of a consequence become a savour of death. The cause that produces death cannot bring to life that which is dead. This will preclude the possibility of renovating the dispensation. It of course must be dissolved and another system established before a work of universal evangelizing can take place. I repeat it again, that the gospel taught right will be believed and obeyed right, and will have the same happy effect it had at its introduction—and there can be but one right way of obeying the gospel. This must be admitted. Now how many wrong ways are there. How much false teaching must there be in support of the different wrong ways, the endless diversities of the Christian religion. As soon as it is shown that there are more right ways than one of obeying the gospel of our Lord and Master, I stand pledged to show that God has more than one way, in force and virtue at the same time, of saving souls,* although the Master has said, "a house divided against itself cannot stand." Notwithstanding he has prayed for a union, yet in bareface contradiction of all this, in the face of day, in the face of heaven's high authority, the necessity of divisions is taught from the pulpit!

But I am almost ready to grant the clergy this position: Their spiritual laws, creeds, &c. are necessary to keep up divisions. Divisions are probably a necessary safe-guard to public weal while they make so many unconverted converts. This may seem a harsh expression; but, reader, are there more ways than one to make Christian converts? And can you tell me how many ways there are in operation in Christendom! No two of their mould bring out the same type. By lies and error you may convert man from one error to another.

*The Mormon's must prove this, or their whole system must "go by the board." I would say nothing to the disparagement of this deluded people. But 'tis a disgrace to the Christian character, to the name, to any man who has ever read a Bible, to believe that absurd book, called "the book of Mormon." It is a matter of astonishment and grief to think of a man in the exercise of reason, for one moment, to give credit to this wretched bundle of lies. It must have been written by an ATHEIST, who did not believe that God would ever call him to judgment for lying in his name. A Yankee trick to make money. The author must have studied barrenness of sentiment and expression, a poverty of style, without an equal in the English language, for the purpose of deception. It carries condemnation in every page. One thing rightly considered, is sufficient to condemn it in the eye of all common sense, setting aside the total lack of evidence throughout the whole work—God never demands faith without evidence.

The great charge is this, it anticipates the Christian religion practises its precepts, ordinances, and teaches its doctrines and worship five or six hundred years before Christ. Such a thing would have been just as illegal as to practise the Jewish religion now; or, by the blood of bulls and goats, to make atonement for the sins of the soul. God has never had two systems of salvation in operation at the same time. If the Jewish system of salvation was of God, it was in full force, was the only legal system of salvation, until abrogated by divine authority. No human being ever did, or ever will foresee, nor dare he, anticipate and practise aforehand the religion of a future dispensation. Before a second be in force and virtue, the first must be done away.

But truth alone believed and obeyed can make converts that will bear inspection when the King comes.

Through custom and false teaching the churches have gotten into a belief that they may "forsake the assembling of themselves together," and be guiltless, without they have a priest to worship for them. I believe the most acceptable worship on earth at this time may be done and performed without the superintendance of a priest at all. Taking the Christian world in the aggregate, priests are a nuisance on the true worship of the heart searching God. I speak in general terms—there are some honorable exceptions. Setting aside the high importance of reading the scriptures in the churches, a respect we owe heaven's authority is barely paid by reading the scripture every Lord's day in our worship. It is a tribute of respect we owe the word of God; and, when neglected, we have not worshipped God acceptably. It was the custom in the church in the pure and uncorrupt age of Christianity, until sermonizing became the rage, and proxy worship was instituted. I shall believe, until experiment proves it ineffectual, that God's word well read in the churches, with a little pious admonition, would make more sound converts, than nine-tenths of those senseless things called sermons.

Cannot congregations assemble and in general afford a good reader? Can they not admonish one another in "psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs"? Can they not lift up "holy hands without wrath and doubting"?

"Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is; but exhorting one another; and so much the more as you see the day approaching." Cannot all this be done without a priest? But false teaching has brought into usage a more convenient plan of worshipping; one for the many; one hireling for two or three churches.

How are the chains of error riveted on the credulous world! All admit there is much error afloat; but it is honestly palmed on some neighboring communities. Spiritual laws, anathemas, excommunications, racks, dungeons, fires, &c. are the very life-guards of error. These, by clerical management and tyranny, have held a lawless dominion over truth, the lives and consciences of men, for nearly 1260 years, the reign of antichrist. New errors are springing up, old ones striking "deeper their vile roots," and will be unconquerable, till the very end of time—unless the strong arm of Omnipotence put a check, the sword of the Lord be "bathed in heaven." Error is the legitimate offspring of false teaching; its existence depends much on the vigilance and industry of those who have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge—being ignorant of God's righteousness, would establish a righteousness of their own. Men may be honest in their errors: so were the Jews while they were crying out, "Crucify him." Will an honest belief and practice of error shield us from the hand of the destroying angel, or from the vials of the wrath of Almighty God? Do impervious difficulties bar the way to truth? When truth cannot be known, justice will pardon error. We can

make nothing right or wrong by honestly believing it so. The Hindoo or Turk, Shaker or Mormon, Jew or Christian, can prove his religion true by his honesty and his conscience—and so with every party in christendom.

[*To be continued.*]

New Version Defended---No. 5.

SOME kind *friend* (not the *Editor of the Episcopal Recorder*) had the politeness to forward me two numbers of that paper, dated in Philadelphia, February 1st and February 8th, containing "Remarks on a New Translation of the New Testament." It is due to all authors and editors, by the laws of courtesy and of the commonwealth of letters, that they be presented with a copy of every paper, pamphlet, and book written against them, by the author. To this usage we always find it a pleasure to conform. We shall, therefore, send to the Editor of the Episcopal Recorder our defence against this assault, though he has judged us unworthy of this courtesy from himself. 'Faith, nor the laws of courtesy, are due to heretics,' said the Mother Church; and her eldest daughter receives this dogma as sound doctrine, and acts upon it.

But in this the "Episcopal Recorder" is not more uncourteous than the "Religious Narrator" of the city of brotherly kindness: for he will neither exchange with me, nor let me see one of his *nightly* lucubrations on the subject of my numerous heresies. Well, gentlemen, twilight for bats and owls, and the night for wild beasts; but God has given the day for *men*.

I will, however, return my thanks to the *Episcopal Recorder*, that he has not greatly descended to the coarse and clownish vulgarisms of Dr. Cleland and his accomplished brotherhood. The Rev. George A. Smith is certainly a more *decent* man than any one of my Presbyterian *reviewers* or *remarkers*. And when decency is out of fashion amongst the priesthood, I feel it my duty to compliment the slightest indication of good breeding in any one of the fraternity.

Opposition to the New Version we anticipated from all that class who love kings and regal bishops, parish churches, large salaries, sprinklings and lustrations—from Calvinists, Arminians, Unitarians, Trinitarians, Socinians, and all who have inherited their consciences and their creeds from a devout sectarian ancestry. We counted the cost, and are prepared for the reckoning.

The Rev. Smith, Editor of this *Episcopalian Recorder*, is, I have said, a more *decent* gentleman than any of my Presbyterian opponents; yet I am sorry to see so many indications of strong prejudices and excited feeling in his pieces before me. I ask no favors. I demand justice, and commend candor. The gentleman seems much more concerned for the dogmas of his church than for the correctness of the New Version. He seems to value the Old more for its favoritism to his creed, than for its fidelity to the original. Hence his first effort to oppose the New Version is directed to the bearings which he supposes

it to have against his notions of the Trinity. He neither defends the Old nor attacks the New, by an appeal to any authority but that of the church. For him it is enough to say, 'The church believes so,' or 'The church believes not so;' and an appeal to the canons of criticism, to dictionaries, and the laws of translators, is not to be made from the decision of placemen, commentators, and creed-makers.

But once more before we descend to particulars: We complain that he should represent us as "*wishing* to support" some peculiar views detrimental to his notions of "the Trinity," because of the *emendations* made on certain passages, *when those who have either authorized or by their voice have sanctioned these emendations, are never once impugned by Mr. Smith as wishing to support any theory at variance with the Episcopalian faith on this article.* This, according to my vision, is flagrant injustice. This is religious assassination with a witness. I have sent to this gentleman my essays upon this question, and will wait to see how much honesty and impartiality enter into his moral constitution

We shall now introduce the gentleman to our readers:—

"The first class of alterations which we shall notice, are those which affect the scriptural evidence for the doctrine of the Trinity. These, as well as our other quotations, we shall, for greater perspicuity, arrange with the translations of Dr. Campbell, &c. in parallel columns.

Matth. xxviii. 19. "Go, therefore, convert all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" —*Dr. Campbell.*	Go convert all the nations, immersing them *into* the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.—*A. Campbell.*

The change of *baptizing* into *immersing*, here and throughout, we shall notice hereafter. The substitution of *into* for *in* is the alteration which we have in view, and which acquires importance from the reasons assigned for its adoption. Mr. Campbell thinks it strange inadvertency in "the king's translators." to translate *eis*, "into;" but does not inform the reader that Doctors Campbell and Doddridge do the same. He thinks the distinction important: "*In the name* is equivalent," he says correctly, to "BY THE AUTHORITY OF;" and, in his opinion, "nothing was ever commanded to be done in the name, or by the authority of *the Holy Spirit*." He strangely overlooks, besides other passages, the thirteenth and twentieth chapters of *Acts;* in the first of which we read, "The Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them—and they being sent forth by the Holy Ghost," &c. In the latter, "The flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers." Our purpose, however, is not to discuss, but simply to exhibit the views which Mr. Campbell wishes to support by his new translation. He continues, "When we speak of authority here, it is not the authority of a governor or lawgiver—of a king or ruler." "His authority as a teacher we cheerfully submit to; but we speak here of the gubernatorial authority," &c. The exercise of this very authority as proved from Acts xx. 28, &c. Trinitarians think a proof of the divinity of the Holy Ghost. Why is it that Mr. Campbell is so anxious, and deems it so important to set it aside? "I scarcely know," he says, "any criticism upon a single syllable, of so much importance, in all the range of my conceptions, as this one."

Determined to give our readers fair play and both sides, we have permitted our remarker to address them in his own words. They have his defence of the common version and his criticism upon ours in this instance *verbatim et punctuatim.* He has not, the reader will see, given his readers one word of my note upon *eis*, nor my reasons for this change. We must, then, request the reader to turn over to Family Testament, App. page 75. The remark upon "authority" is rather incidental, as a corroborating consideration, than the reason adduced for the preference given to *into.*

But this is a proof of my wishing to support a view of the Trinity opposed to the sound catholic faith on this head; of course, in all good reason, it will prove the same in every one who uses it. Then Dr. Lightfoot, Prolocutor of the Westminster Assembly, was "wishing to support" the same views with myself: for in vol. 2, p. 274 of his works, he uses the following words:—"The Jews baptized proselytes

into the name of the Father; that is, *into* the profession of God, whom they called by the name of Father. The Apostles baptized the Jews *into* the name of Jesus the Son; and the Gentiles *into* the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Lightfoot was, then, an antitrinitarian in the balances of Mr. Smith.

Was not Mr. J. Burroughs orthodox? He says the true meaning of the commission is, "baptizing *into* the profession of that doctrine which is the mind and counsel of God the Father, made known to mankind by the Son, and confirmed by the mighty operation of the Holy Ghost." [Discourses on Positive Institutions, p. 41.] The great Lardner, too, must share our fate with Mr. Smith: for, says he, vol. 10, p. 138. "Go ye, therefore, into all the world, and teach or disciple all nations, baptizing them *into* the profession of faith in, and an obligation to obey the doctrine taught by Christ, with authority from God the Father, and confirmed by the Holy Ghost." So he paraphrases the charge, Matth. xxviii. 19. And in vol. 7, p. 637, he quotes Julian the Apostate, as appealing to Matth. xxviii. 19. in the acceptation of it in the year 351. "How, then, says Julian, is Jesus said in the gospels to command, "Go, teach all nations, baptizing them *into* the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit"?

"*To be baptized into the name of any person*, or *into a person*, is solemnly as Locke observes, to enter oneself a disciple of him into whose name he is baptized, and to profess that he submits himself implicitly to his authority, and receives his doctrines and rules. In this sense the Israelites are said (1 Cor. x. 2.) to have *been baptized into Moses, in the cloud and in the sea*."—Adam Clarke.

Macknight translates 1 Cor. chap. i. verse 13. "Were you baptized *into* the name of Paul?" instead of "*in* the name of Paul," as in the common version.

What say you to this, Mr. Smith? Were not Locke and Macknight "wishing to support some antitrinitarian views!"

King James' translators, too, are worthy of suspicion according to Mr. Smith's logic—wishing to support some grievous heresy: for they render the same phrase by *into* on various occasions. Rom. vi. 3. "Know you not that so many of us as were baptized *into* Jesus Christ were baptized *into* his death?" Paul here positively affirms that himself and all the Romans were baptized *into* Jesus Christ. But the King's translators are to be suspected as "wishing to support" some erroneous views by their translation! Adam Clarke also frequently interprets on this wise: "Christians receiving Christian baptism are said to be baptized INTO Christ, and are thereby brought under obligation to keep the precepts of the gospel." 1 Cor. x. 1. *et in mul locis.*

"Most commentators," says Professor Stuart, "after Vitringa," (a very great name, indeed,) "explain *eis* as meaning INTO *the acknowledgment of;* with an implication of affiance, subjection, discipleship," &c. On the Romans, p. 251. He, therefore, on all occasions where *eis* occurs in reference to baptism, renders it by *into*. Is he not worthy of suspicion and condemnation also at the bar of the Episcopal Recorder?

But not to multiply authorities, unnecessarily, I will add only another great heretic, who, in the judgment of the natives of Old England, is the greatest *Divine* ever New England or America produced. Hear him, will you, Mr. Smith? T. Dwight, D. D. vol. 4, p. 318:—

"All persons are baptized, not *in*, but *into*, the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; that is, they are in this ordinance publicly and solemnly introduced into the family, and entitled in a peculiar manner to the name, of God. Accordingly they are called *Godly, Christians, Spiritual, Sons and Daughters of God*, and *Children of God*, throughout the Scriptures. That this is the true construction of the passage just quoted, I think, obvious from the Greek phraseology, *eis to onoma*, the proper English of which is, *into the name*. Accordingly it is customarily rendered in this manner by the translators of our Bible, in those passages where the same subject is mentioned. Thus, Rom. vi. 3, 4, St. Paul asks, "Know ye not, that so many of us, as were baptized *into* Jesus Christ, were baptized *into* his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism *into* death." 1 Cor. xii. 13. "For by one Spirit we were all baptized *into* one body." Gal. iii 27. "As many of you, as have been baptized *into* Christ, have put on Christ." In all these instances the phraseology is the same with that just quoted; and, from analogy, teaches us, that it ought, there also, to have been rendered in the same manner: *into* being the original and proper meaning of the preposition; and *in*, being a meaning so uncommon, as heretofore to have been resolved into a *Hebraism*. Several of these passages, also, directly declare, that those, who are baptized, are baptized into Christ; that is, into the church, or body of Christ. At the same time, there is no other account given of this subject. Nor is there any thing in the ordinance of baptism, which in any manner indicates, that adults, when baptized, are members of the church; and that baptized infants are not members.

To these observations it is to be added, that there is but one passage, in which *in the name of Christ* is joined with the verb baptize; Acts ii. 38, where the preposition is *epi*. It is also to be observed, that the preposition *eis* is never used in any other case, where any thing is done, or said to be done, in the name of Christ; denoting that it is done by his authority. I conclude, therefore, that all those persons, who have been baptized, are members of the Christian church."

Now let the reader decide how much ground, and how good ground this Episcopal Recorder has to *insinuate* sinister motive in translating Matth. xxviii. 19. as in the new version. He has *not*, however, given in the opposite columns what he has pleased to call my version of the verse—perhaps the fault is the Printer's, and not the Editor's. I do not believe there is a man of any real pretensions to literature in christendom that will undertake to sustain the common version of Matth. xxviii. 19. That many learned men have passed over it without reflection, or inquiry as to its propriety, I doubt not; and amongst these were Drs. Campbell and Doddridge. But their own rules and reasons of procedure in similar cases, only show that if they had examined this matter as Dr. Dwight and a hundred others, they certainly would have rendered it *into*, as Macknight has done in the Epistles. I am sustained in this version by a constellation of the greatest names in the Protestant world: by all the Dictionaries which give *into* as the common and literal meaning of *eis:* for, as Montesquieu affirms, "In all laws and solemn institutions the words are always to be understood in the most common acceptation;" and Dr. Doddridge affirms the same, when he declares that the meaning which a man of good common sense must naturally deduce from a word or phrase in any connexion, is its true import: or, in words to this effect.

A second paragraph shall suffice for the present:—

"In connexion with this we notice the "emendation" made in Hebrews ix. 14.

How much more shall the blood of Christ who through *the* eternal Spirit offered himself without fault to God, cleanse your conscience from dead works, &c.—*Macknight.*

How much more shall the blood of Christ, who by *the* eternal Spirit offered himself spotless to God, &c.—*Doddridge.*

How much more shall the blood of Christ who through *an* Eternal Spirit offered himself, &c.—*A. Campbell.*

Of the fact of this alteration, or the reasons which occasioned it, there is, so far as we can discover, no intimation given—that it is one of importance, will appear from the remark of Doddridge, that the expression (as given in the common version) "seems a plain testimony to the *eternity*, and consequently the *deity* of the Holy Spirit."

Does Mr. S. sustain his objection by any argument? Not one. Does he say or pretend that the article *the*, or its representative, is in the original? He does not. But my motive is arraigned because I have given to the English reader all that is in the original. This also proves me antitrinitarian. Be it so. I am in good company—Professor Stuart renders it as I have done. [See his version of the Epistle to the Hebrews.] He renders it, "*By an eternal Spirit*"—I, "Through an eternal Spirit." He follows Theophilact in thus rendering it; and they both paraphrase the passage thus:– "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who, in an eternal spiritual nature, offered himself without spot to God, purify our consciences from dead works." So that in the judgment of these heretics, (Stuart and Theophilact,) it refers not at all to the Spirit of God or the Holy Spirit. "In verses 11 and 12 of this chapter Christ is represented as entering the heavenly sanctuary *with his own blood*, in order to expiate the sins of the people, or to procure *lutrosin*, i. e. deliverance from the penalty of the divine law, for them. It is, then, in the heavenly world, in the tabernacle not made with hands, that the offering of our great High Priest is made. There he has presented himself in his heavenly or glorified state, in his eternal spiritual condition, or possessed of an eternal spiritual nature, as the victim that had been slain, x. 10—12. i. 3, 27. Rev. v. 9. Eph. v. 2.—and there his blood that had been shed, is virtually offered to make atonement—not *literally*, but *spiritually*—i. e. in a manner congruous with the spiritual temple in which he ministers." So far Stuart.

Bishop Pierce, on this passage, says, "The nature of Paul's argument seems to lead us to consider this *spirit* as signifying the divine nature of our Lord." Was your Bishop Pierce a *heretic* like your humble servant?

If, now, the Episcopal Recorder will follow my example, and republish in his paper what I have here written, as I have republished *all* that he has said on these two passages, in my indictment for heresy and impure motive—I will think he is an honest man—honest to his readers. If not, he must be added to the long catalogue of my calumniators, who will have to be referred to that tribunal from which there is no appeal.

I am glad to see the attention which the new version is receiving from all denominations; and, if the Lord preserve my life, I hope to be able to defend it in all capital matters, against each and every assault, from any pen or tongue on this continent. God, who knows the secrets of all hearts, knows that I have not given a single turn to word or particle in the version, to favor an opinion of my own or of any one else. Therefore, I am neither afraid nor ashamed to appear before any man to sustain every thing for which I am responsible.

I trust the opposition will shed much light on many passages, and give me an opportunity of giving my reasons *in extenso* for all that for which I am responsible to my heavenly Father, or my fellow-men.

And if any man, of any name in this or any other country, will give me any new light, or convict me of any error, I will thank him for it—even if it should not be done in the most courteous manner.

EDITOR.

Reply to Mr. Waterman.

[CONTINUED.]

Dear Sir,

YOU will permit me now to go into the details of the already published part of your epistle. Having drawn the outlines of true charity, and a Christian spirit, and shown that whatever reason you may have for dissenting from my judgment or reasonings on the points of difference, you have no scriptural grounds for accusing my spirit, or the spirit of my writings. May I not be permitted to reply to some minute matters, before I lay any more of your communication before our readers. They will please read over again your letter as far as published, that they may appreciate the force of my remarks.

On page 59, after noticing the extravagances of some Cumberland Presbyterians, with an air of ridicule, you apologize for your scepticism in all reformations. In this way a celebrated Doctor of the Jewish church apologized for his scepticism in the Apostles' teaching. He told an anecdote about two preachers, one Mr. Theudas, and one Mr. Judas, a Galilean, (not a Cumberlander) who arose in those days to make parties. They came to nothing. Cautiously and prudently, then, he determined to be "a little sceptical and tardy about taking a passage in these religious conveyances to the good world, until he saw how they worked." Now, my dear sir, think not, (as you seem to have reasoned on other occasions,) that I compare you with this Dr. Gamaliel; nor myself with the Apostles. I only compare your logic and his: and, although you are very different characters indeed, your *logic* is the same. You add, "I must still linger in the old path so long as I can see the track of my Master." The "*old path*"! How old? John Wesley's path is not yet one hundred years old. He only began to survey it about a hundred years ago, and it was forty years before he had opened it from end to end. Moses led all Israel from Egypt to the Jordan before Mr. Wesley finished his discipline and the order of his government. Some think that he had his *Joshua* too, who, after he died, divided the land by lot, and gave the suburbs of the cities to the priests and Levites. But of this you are a better judge than I am. But, be this as it may, your reasons for repudiating our course would have led you to have opposed John Wesley when he set about making the *old path*. Now, however, that you see the "Master's track" in John's old path, you have had good reason to walk in it. If here I reason wrong, you have beguiled me into it: for your context prevents me from thinking of any other old path, than that of the father of Methodism.

Robert Barclay's still older path, you next lay before us. You discover in us some strong points of resemblance to him, else Oliver Cromwell would as well have served your purpose. Well, now, what are they? He stood forth as a harbinger of the Millennium, and so do we. This is your point, if there be any point in the case. Now, fanatical as I might suppose Friend Barclay to have been, I never before knew that he either regarded himself, or was regarded by his brethren as the harbinger of the Millennium. And that I have ever so represented myself, you can bring no word nor action of my life to prove. It is wholly a gratuitous insinuation, for the sake of ridicule! Ridicule, however, it is now universally agreed, is not the test of truth. It is, indeed, most generally the resort of error and pusilanimity. The sceptics of every creed have now got a patent for it against the Bible; and if matters progress much longer in this course, Truth will refuse its use, except in the way of retaliation and in making reprisals.

Because I have chosen for a title of a periodical the name of the *Millennial Harbinger*, because of its devotion to the principles which all christendom admits must spread before the Millennium commence and triumph in that happy period, must I be represented as superlatively ridiculous, pretending to be the angel flying in the midst of heaven, or as the *personal* forerunner of the Millennium? Then every author or writer is in fact the subject of which he treats. Milton was at one time "Paradise Lost"—at another time, "Paradise Regained." Addison was "The Evidences of Christianity," the "Spectator," &c. Johnson was the "Rambler," and the "Dictionary of the English Language," &c. How often I have shown that all christendom concedes the ground on which we stand, and admits the plea which we urge for the Bible alone—no human bonds of union—apostolic gospel and order of things—I need not now repeat to those who have carefully read what we have already written.

But you only intended a laugh, in your truly Christian spirit, by way of reprisal for "unchurching you," or the imputation of a Babylonish parentage to your fraternity. Of this I frankly acknowledge I am worthy of accusation; and, perhaps, for so doing, you may convict me of the want of "charity" before a packed jury.

I have manifested "an unchristian spirit" in thinking that the Protestant sects are the "impure brood" of the Mother of Harlots. Well, *whose* brood are they? Or has the Roman Hierarchy any daughters? And if she have, where shall we find them? Among Jews, Turks, Pagans, or Christians?

To leave out of view this "impure brood" as it is found in other sects, let me come right to your own door, and to the point. The Methodist is the daughter of the English Hierarchy, and the English Hierarchy is the daughter of Babylon the Great, if there be any Babylon the Great on earth. The Methodist sect contends for *her right to administer ordinances derived from the Catholic priesthood;* and, therefore, she recognizes her own parentage and owns herself the daughter of the daughter of the Mother of Harlots.

It is not the fact of having been born in any sect, or educated in any sect, that makes a person the descendant of that sect in the book of religious genealogies. He must either cleave to it; or if he separate from it, he must own his descent from it, by building upon its foundation, and recognizing its authority. Do not the Methodist clergy receive ordination at the hands of those who receive ordination from the English Hierarchy? And does not the English Hierarchy admit the validity of Popish ordination in order to make out her right and title to the dispensation of Christian ordinances?

The grace of the priesthood, which dwelt in the legs and arms of Pope Leo X. dwelt in the Archbishops of York and Canterbury, and now dwells in J. A. Waterman, and all the regularly ordained Ministers of the *Methodist* Episcopal *Church*.

This, my good sir, is your ecclesiastic lineage; and as I have never heard of your renunciation of it, but of your sustaining it in word and deed, by precept and example, let me ask you, Do I err in my judgment in deciding that your sect is the grand-daughter of the Mother of Harlots; provided you admit that the Roman Hierarchy is that Mother of Abominations? If I err in this, attribute it not to an unchristian spirit, but to lack of information, or an illogical mind. This is my sincere conviction; and I am justified by your own example, and the instructions of Paul and all the Apostles, *charitably* to express it.

I have known many worthy Methodists—many excellent Episcopalians—some good Catholics; but if there were not more than ten righteous in these ecclesiastic cities, they would not have remained to this day.

You all boast of many benevolent schemes, of great zeal, of many missionaries, of much success, of many proselytes, of many "outpourings of the Holy Ghost," of still increasing dominions; and you have great *charity* for one another. I see in you all the same family features; and although you now and then have some family feuds and bickerings, you soon make them up again; and, like the outfalls of lovers, it is but the renewing of love.

You have many wise *policies* among you, great tact, much talent, a good deal of learning, and many *pious* souls to sanctify the whole. But, sir, I cannot help believing that Jesus is the Son of God; no more can I help believing that you are all, as sects, *not as men*, foreordained to destruction. There is not a limb of the old Mother, be it found where it may, that will not be thrown into the burning fire; for strong is the Lord who avenges her who has turned out his apostles and prophets, and shed the blood of his saints, or *built the monuments of them that abused them!*

When you attempt to show that you are not, *as a sect*, descended from this ancestry, and that you are *constitutionally* the church of God, I will, *in extenso*, give my reasons for the judgment which I have expressed. Meanwhile, *the earnest* which I have given must suffice till I have got through with the communication on hand.

On pages 109 and 110, you seem to admit *the five-headed Priesthood* of which I spoke, and proceed to defend your *morals*. You say you have bishops without concubines, and elders without indulgences in their pockets. As I brought no such charge against you, I have nothing to sustain on this subject. But, sir, is there nothing but good morals to be sought after in bishops and presiding elders? Suppose Congress should make a *King*, would it be good sense to inform the citizens of the United States that it was all *constitutional* and *republican*, because this King was not so profligate as Henry VIII.! I do not care your bishops and priesthood were as *moral* as Paul or Peter, I still argue that they are *illegitimate*. Their morality and virtue will not consecrate their official relations to your community. The office is not of God, but of the Pope; and the virtue of the officer will not sanctify the office.

There are multitudes professing the Christian religion who think that *morality* is every thing it contemplates; and that to censure a moral society because of its disregard of positive institutions, is of the essence of bigotry. But so long as I remember that the things which happened to the Jews, happened to them for types, and that they are written for our admonition; and so long as I remember that Uzzah was struck dead for violating a positive institution; and that fifty thousand and seventy men of Bethshemesh fell in one day for violating another positive command; although in both cases they appeared to act from good motives and a deep concern for the honor of God, I cannot substitute good moral behaviour nor sectarian zeal for keeping the positive institutions of Heaven.

I am now taking it for granted that Methodists are just as moral and zealous as reformers amongst us. But even then if we have and keep the institutions of Jesus Christ, and you have them not, you cannot balance the account by including your numbers—your great and "growing prosperity." There may be still as much difference between us as there is between the two sorts of zeal of which Paul speaks—*a zeal according to knowledge*, and *a zeal according to ignorance*. It was neither for theft, fornication, nor murder, but for breaking a positive institution, that mankind lost the garden of Eden!

But you say, "The doctrine of the divine right of church government is to you as absurd as the opinion of the Pope's infallibility." Well, then, you ought to be very kind to your brethren, the *Radicals;* for their church government, in your own opinion, is, at least, as *divine* as yours. "Where there is no law there is no transgression." Papacy is but church government—Episcopacy is but church government—Presbyterianism and Independentism are but church government, and all alike *divine, in your opinion;* for there is as much *divine* right for one as for another! This is Erastianism with a witness. But that is only a *hard word*, and I proceed.

You say you "cannot learn that the reformation you and your brethren plead for, relates to moral improvement, and the correction of erroneous opinions in doctrine, so much as to forms of worship and the regulation of the externals of religion." Strange, indeed!! You

cannot learn!! Persons of much duller apprehension learn that we labor too much for the correction of errors in doctrine, and blame us for being too strict in our terms of membership—too rigid disciplinarians. But *learn* as you, or they may, we *teach* that unless the righteousness of our brethren excel that of the Scribes and Pharisees, they cannot be admitted into the kingdom of glory. Religion with us has no *externals*. Forms and ceremonies we bequeath to those who are fond of weak and beggarly elements. But we do not rank the positive commandments of Jesus amongst the externals of religion, nor place them among forms and ceremonies. We are very far, indeed, from being content that our brethren are only as *moral* as the bulk of professors of this age. If their knowledge and faith and hope terminate only in the decent morality of sectarianism, then we labor in vain. But, sir, we expect every institution of Christ, moral or positive, to exert a purifying and moralizing influence upon all who understand and obey it. The end and design of every divine institution is moral purity and rational happiness. And no man is so pure, so holy, so happy, as he who exactly walks in all the commandments and ordinances of the gospel. If there can be pure morality, acceptable worship, and rational happiness in neglecting or changing one of the least requirements of Jesus in the letter and spirit of it—then is that requirement superfluous and foolish.

But, my friend Waterman, you have a decided advantage over me, and I cannot deprive you of it. The public taste, conscience, and judgment, being the offspring of the popular theory of religion, you cannot fail to have the many with you when talk about "LIBERALITY," "CHARITY," and "THE EXTERNALS OF RELIGION." No three words have so much magic in them as these. A popular saint is a gentleman of great liberality, charity, and contempt for the externals of religion. Sir Walter Scott made a perfect saint out of the Duke of York by the majesty of these three words. The royal Duke had many faults before Sir Walter laid his pencil upon him; but no sooner had he drawn his likeness, and thrown around him the triple glory of liberality, charity, and contempt for the externals of religion; and superadded his zeal for the benevolent institutions of the day, than every admirer of the picture looked in vain for the faults he once saw in his Sacred Highness.

If I were charged with any crime worthy of death by our laws, I would, if I could, challenge every juror who believes in the doctrine of capital punishments. My friend Vardeman, of Missouri, was always sure to carry the question about the orthodoxy of his notions of religious experience and the attributes of true conversion, when he appealed to those converted under his ministry. And, therefore, you have ten chances to my one in this *enlightened age*—of Christian enterprize, of contempt for bigotry and the externals of religion—this age of charity, liberality, and Christian magnanimity. You are sure of success if you contemn "the externals," and go for the Quaker's text, that "God is a spirit, and must be worshipped in spirit." With the Quaker's comment on this verse, all is safe in your hands.

Liberality, charity, and contempt for the externals of religion! What powerful Divinities are these! I am, indeed, afraid when I approach their splendid temples, to say, that I, too, admire liberality and charity; for unless I go for the *contempt of the externals*, I know I will not be believed, and must be spurned from their presence.

Vocal prayer and praise, as well as the *outward* observance of the Lord's day—baptism, the Lord's supper, and every thing that requires the movement of the tongue, lips, hand, foot, or body of man, is among *the externals of religion;* therefore, I cannot offer even a turtle-dove on the altar of that temple erected in honor of *Contempt for the Externals of Religion.*

One sentence more, and I think I have cleared the docket, as far as filed on the pages of the *Harbinger*. You say, "A religious reformer, without the temper and spirit of Christ, is a curse to the world." Such was John Calvin—such was Martin Luther—such, you add, were the Puritans—and such, in your judgment, is your humble servant. Such, however, was not *John Wesley!* Well, from the first three *curses* have sprung all the political *blessings* of the three last centuries. And had it not been for the *curse* of Luther, John Wesley never could have *blessed* England or America. Perhaps the good Lord may yet convert the *curse* of our efforts also into a *blessing*.

Very charitably, your sincere friend,

EDITOR.

P. S.—Your letter already received shall appear in its due series—and it gives me pleasure to learn that you repudiate the *illiberal* and *uncharitable* course of your brethren who control the Methodistic press. The communications you have promised will be thankfully received.

Conversations in Father Goodal's Family Circle, at Mr. Fowler's.

Continued from page 67.

Father Goodal.—METHOD is almost another name for reason: for there is no reason without it. In acquiring knowledge it is as essential as in communicating it. Some men's minds are like a well assorted and regulated house—which has a place for every thing, and every thing in its place; while others resemble the library of the occupant of the Castle of Topsy Turvy, in which there was a place for no volume, and no volume in its place. Folios and tracts, magazines and dictionaries, grammars and histories, were piled together in one promiscuous mass. Indeed, from the cellar to the garret in that edifice, it was one continuous scene of confusion and disorder. So are the minds of some men. Their ideas are in perfect chaos; they have not a clear perception of any thing; and when they converse with you, you never can anticipate a sentence. Like a ludicrous author who defied his reader to imagine what was on the next page,

these talkers defy the listener to tell what is to be expected next. But this class never can have influence in society. It is as impossible for them to acquire knowledge, as for a poor man to become rich without economy.

In reference to the art of memorizing the Scriptures, the following method my own experience suggested to me. Take up the writings of one author at a time, and in the order of his composition, familiarize his style, his trains of thought, his modes of narrating or explaining a matter, and often repeat what is already committed to memory. Small portions, perfectly committed, are easily retained; and when the additions are daily, they soon amount to considerable. In my family we committed on one day what we repeated on the next; and two evenings in the week we repeated the lessons of the preceding part of it. An Epistle was never dismissed till it could be all repeated at a single lesson.

Mr. Williamson.—In a large family it would require the most part of an evening to hear all its members repeat so largely; and would not this interfere with our other duties?

Father Goodal.—To every duty we must attend in proper season; but we may create many duties, and make so much business for ourselves as to have no leisure for prayer, meditation, and reading the Scriptures. Every Christian family makes intellectual and moral improvement the real business of life, and all its temporal arrangements are held and kept in obeisance to this high object.

Mr. Fowler.—Do you say *every* Christian family, Father Goodal? Then have we but few Christian families: for in the bounds of my knowledge I do not know twenty families that spend one hour per day in mental and moral improvement in the things of religion. A chapter is read, a psalm sung, and a prayer made morning and evening; but this is considered a large sacrifice of time to the Lord. But there is not one hour's conversation on what is read, or on the fear of the Lord, in a month, as far as my intimacies with these families inform me.

Father Goodal.—Then are they barren Christians; for you would as soon succeed in convincing me that a family could be healthy on one meal per day, or on three meals in the week, as that it could be healthy in the Lord on such poor and stinted religious allowance. Religion, or the knowledge and fear of the Lord, must necessarily be the chief business of every Christian family; for if it occupy not the whole heart, it is but a name.

Mr. Reed.—I am supposed, by sister Reed, to be somewhat fanciful in my views of the education of a Christian family. One thing I will cheerfully admit—that I am more *theoretical* than *practical;* for I have not yet carried out my theory into practice, though I have experimented a little—so much, indeed, as to satisfy me that it is practicable and profitable. It is true that my theory supposes a family to be not in its infancy, but capable of thinking and receiving information from the works of God and from his word. My theory is this: Distribute all the knowledge of which we are capable in this state of

probation, into three chapters—Nature, Society, and Religion. This lies over the vast surface of the three volumes which God has put into our hands—Creation, Providence, and Redemption. I appropriate three hours each day for these three studies. In the morning, Nature; after dinner, Providence; in the evening, Redemption. I cannot say the morning for nature, the noon for society, and the evening for religion, because I find religion in Nature, in Providence, and in Redemption.

Mr. Williamson.—What is your text-book for Nature and Society? I can guess your text-book for Religion.

Mr. Reed.—The heavens and the earth, with all their fulness, riches, and glory, for Nature—all history, ancient and modern, political and ecclesiastical, for Society—and the Bible for Religion, and for an infallible commentator upon the other two volumes.

Mr. Williamson.—But how can you teach your family from so large a volume as that of nature? I can imagine how you can get along with history and the Bible for the second and third sections of your labors, but I am at a loss to understand how you would manage so large a volume as the heavens and the earth and all that in them is!

Mr. Reed.—Classification is all that is necessary to make this volume as manageable as either of the others. I divide it first into the heavens and the earth; then the earth into its animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms.

Mr. Williamson.—Then you make astronomy co-extensive with what you teach concerning the heavens—and geography embrace all that pertains to the three kingdoms of Nature, which you have just now enumerated.

Mr. Reed.—Geography is sometimes used as latitudinous as to cover these three kingdoms; but geography proper comprehends not my course. I begin with the animal kingdom, because all children have the greatest curiosity for these locomotive creatures; then the vegetable; and last the mineral. The oceans, seas, lakes, rivers, the continents, islands, mountains, hills, and valleys inhabited by these animals and filled with these productions, vegetable and mineral, fall always in our way, and make geography an easy and agreeable study. But really my theory here is greatly in advance of my practice. But so far I am convinced that in a free familiar conversational style, and a few elementary books, children may acquire in this way a larger share of knowledge, useful and ornamental, than is usually acquired at our best preparatory schools.

Mr. Williamson.—But your theory, Mr. Reed, supposes every father is a philosopher, a general scholar, of didactic habits, and indeed an experienced teacher; and, therefore, I would take sides with Mrs. Reed, and vote with her that it is impracticable for the great majority.

Mr. Reed.—Only impracticable for the illiterate to commence or to take the lead in such a course. But let it be once commenced, and a few become expert in it, and, in my judgment, it would soon obtain; for all those educated in this way, would never think of bringing up a family in the common manner.

Mrs. Reed.—Mr. Williamson has not yet hit upon my principal objection: though I have told my good husband that however it might fall within his means so to instruct his children and household, it would not be within the power of many. But I object to its practicability in the present circumstances of society. Mr. Reed always wishes me to be present at these readings and conversational meetings, and even our servants must often be called in; and to manage my family, and have our three meals in good time, and my household appareled to suit the seasons as they come upon us, I find to be quite impracticable. I know he preaches and practises early rising, and some days in the week I can get along pretty well, and gain three hours; but when we have company we sometimes sit up too late, and then we lose half an hour in rising, and this throws us behind for a day, and that accumulates business for the next; and, indeed, I have sometimes found an hour lost this way not to be recovered in two or three days.

Mr. Reed.—But, my dear, you know a part of my theory is to go to bed and rise as early when we have company as when alone; and if we would rise superior to the force of circumstances, and make our domestic laws like those of the Medes and Persians, we should find those apparent difficulties quite surmountable. I urge the necessity of making our own circumstances, if we would advance our own mental and moral interests and those of society.

Mrs. Reed.—But, my dear husband, you remember that you found last summer, that although you had some very religious and excellent men employed upon your farm, and although they were much pleased to sit an hour before or after breakfast, and another hour after dinner, and hear your conversations, readings, and lectures to me and the children; when you were paying them their wages they required the last farthing which is paid by other farmers, who do not lose a minute in the whole day, except while eating. Now, unless you could control all these circumstances also, and give new customs to society, your own circumstances would oblige you to desist from a course so detrimental to your finances.

Father Goodal.—Our sister Reed now reasons as Mother Goodal was wont to reason some thirty years ago, when I had a very large household, and many persons in my employment. She, too, thought that it was enough to sacrifice the time of my own children, without paying others for receiving instruction. But I reformed so far as to rise half an hour earlier and sit half an hour later; and as I did not lose more time at dinner than other farmers, I found my barns and cellars were always as well replenished as those of my neighbors.

Mother Goodal.—Let me add, that now I am fully convinced, from the results of Father Goodal's course through life, that his plan was the best I ever knew, and it has proved itself to be profitable both for the present life and also for the future.

Mrs. Reed.—But, Mother Goodal, Mr. Reed goes for *three* hours, and you did not spend more than *two*.

Mother Goodal.—Father Goodal always called it *two* hours; but

really as often it was *three* hours in the day as *two*. And I remember one of his former maxims was, that 'time consumed in praying and reading the Scriptures was never missed in harvest.'

Mrs Reed.—But Mr. Reed embraces universal science as well as religion in his plan, and therefore I cannot have so much faith as if it was all for religion.

Mr. Reed.—But like Samson, I find honey in a dead lion, and can draw religion from every flour and butterfly in creation.

Father Goodal.—I think sister Reed argues her side of the question well; but brother Reed has got the advantage here. There are extremes on all sides; and wisdom will teach when we should yield to circumstances, and when we should rise above them.

Mr. Williamson.—In America industrious farmers begin to work by the dawn of day, and never quit the field till they see the stars again. They eat their supper, and in the summer season in half an hour after are fast asleep. But they die rich.

Mr. Reed.—And that told, all their history is told in one sentence. We have some farmers in this country, and some merchants and mechanics too, who post their books on Sunday, and labor all week, to have it told that they died *well*—that is, *rich*. Sometimes, however, they die poor, and are doubly curst—first in this life, and then in that to come. They have robbed God, themselves, and their children; and it often goes ill with them that are left in their tabernacle.

Mrs. Reed.—If, indeed, we live according to nature, to reason, and religion, in food, raiment, and furniture, I will concede that all my husband's theory may be carried into practice, but otherwise my experience in economics is against its practicability.

Father Goodal.—Which, then, is the wiser and better way—to raise up a well educated family—intelligent, moral, industrious—in a word, religious; or to raise up one to labor for the food that perishes in the using; to eat, drink, and sleep like the beasts that perish? I presume on this question we will all vote on the same side.

Mr. Williamson.—But would Mr. Reed have his daughters receive the same education?

Father Goodal.—My hour of adjournment has come, and we shall have to postpone this part of the subject till another evening.

Mr. Reed.—At my residence on Thursday evening, having the promise of all the present company and some friends from a distance, we shall have an opportunity to finish this subject.

After singing a few hymns the family retired. EDITOR.

Dr. A. Cleland.

MERCER COUNTY, KENTUCKY.

Mr. Campbell,

I HAVE read much from your very lucid and graphic pen, since you penned the preface to the first volume of that inimitable work, "*The Christian Baptist*," dated "Buffaloe, July 4th, 1823;" and I must confess, though yet in Babylon myself, which I, in common with many

of my dear brethren, are ashamed of—that I have been much pleased, and, I hope, greatly edified, by your Christian labors.

If I mistake not, you have somewhere, perhaps in the fifth volume of the Christian Baptist, said, that all the good and virtuous in all sects belong to Jesus Christ; and if you belong to him, they are your brethren. They cannot (you remark) help being your brethren, and you cannot help loving them. Jesus the Lord cares not to what party the bad belong; neither do I nor you. Again you say, that you hope many will stand at the right hand of the Judge in the great day, who cannot now walk on the same side of the street, and feast together in the heavenly kingdom, who cannot now break bread together on earth; and that you will never conduct yourself towards any professor, who walks piously, in such a way, that you would feel ashamed to sit by his side, or at his feet, in the King's own country. These are noble and liberal sentiments, that do, in my estimation, and ought, in my humble opinion, in the estimation of *all men*, to exalt you as much above the low and grovelling Doctors of Divinity and Jesuitical Priests of this age as the heavens are above the earth, and who are fastening, with almost insupportable chains, the traditions of the fathers on the people, and thereby making their darkness grosser and grosser, until not a ray of New Testament Christianity is seen to sparkle in their synagogues, for houses of Christian worship they cannot be called. And now, sir, for the information of the public, may this communication be seen in your useful and widely circulating periodical?

For the information of distant readers, I would state the following particulars, that they may the better understand this communication concerning this celebrated Doctor of Presbyterianism. He is full of scars and wounds which he has received from various New Testament heretics, with whom he has fought violently and wickedly in defence of the traditions of his fathers, and for which traditions he is even more exceedingly zealous than the rest of his compeers. He is the author of a number of essays against New Testamentism, but which he opprobriously tries to dub "*Campbellism*," and which were first published in the ever-to-be-lamented and so called *Western Luminary*, whose light has long since become like to that of Jack-of-the-lantern. These essays of this celebrated Doctor have been collected into a pamphlet form for the edification and consolation of "all orthodox ministers of every name." They contain some jolting charges against you, sir, for money-making on the editions of the New Testament and your periodicals. This renowned champion in the cause of traditions is believed to be the author of that most wonderful piece which appeared some time since in this Luminary against you, and signed *Thomas Paine*, Jun. in which we have the following sublime phrases amongst many others, to wit:—"Black dog philosophy," "swine wallowing in mudholes," &c. &c. But this Doctor is for the fleece, and not for the flock. Ah! sir, he dearly loves the mammon of unrighteousness, as the following circumstance will show. He has two synagogues in which he preaches traditions—one in Harrods-

burg, Mercer county, Kentucky; the other seven miles from that place, called Providence. As these two synagogues sowed very sparingly last year of their temporal things, this jesuitical defender of the Abrahamic mark determined they should reap but sparingly of his "sound theology." He therefore feigned sickness to arouse his members' sympathies, and set his fruitful imagination to work to get from them more money. He therefore most piteously let them know his health had become extremely bad—so much so, that he deemed it impossible to attend but one of these synagogues, and that he would leave it to them to determine which of them should have his sacred services. By this manœuvre, sir, you will readily see he put himself upon the auction block, and *the highest bidder* had to take him down. Each one of them commenced bidding against the other, until their voices became so loud, distinct, and cheering, that all at once the Doctor felt a pecuniary and all-restoring shock of convalescence run through him, and which so speedily restored him to perfect health, that he informed them that he then felt able to attend them both; and since, sir, (extraordinary as it may, and does appear to all of us here, who witnessed the scene,) the time each of these voices struck each one of the Doctor's sick ears, we have heard no more of his bad health. This unholy course of the Doctor's determined me to have nothing more to do with such unfruitful works, and I hope I begin to see my way clear to get out of the scarlet city, and most sincerely hope that my dear friends behind will examine their grounds of sectarian tyranny, bigotry, and superstition, and move up to New Testament Christianity. May the Lord bless them!

Yours, A PRESBYTERIAN.

The Gift of the Holy Spirit.

King William, Va. Jan. 28, 1834.

Dear Brother Campbell,

BEING again confined to my room, but so far relieved as to be able to sit up, without much pain, I feel a disposition to amuse myself by setting down a few thoughts for your consideration, and, after my old fashion, making some inquiries.

I do not understand how it is, that you contend for the "gift of the Holy Spirit," subsequently to immersion, when in the appendix to your family testament, you confine "the gift of the Holy Spirit," mentioned in Acts ii. 38, to "the splendid miraculous influences of the Holy Spirit." I had thought, you relied on this passage to prove that no person can, according to Scripture, expect "the gift of the Holy Spirit," before immersion. I have lately caught the idea, that one of the great difficulties, which perplex and bewilder the mind in reference to this subject, is the confoundiug of the Holy Spirit, and his influences; and, when the Spirit himself is spoken of, the explaining of the passage to mean such or such *influences* of the Spirit. Thus, for instance, when John vii. 38, of his testimony, says, "This spoke

he (Jesus) of the Spirit, which they who believe, should receive, for the Holy Spirit was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified" —those, who maintain that the Spirit was given before the glorification of Jesus, explain away this passage, by saying, the Holy Spirit himself is not meant in this place, but certain *miraculous influences*. And not long since a popular preacher,* who contends for special influences of the Spirit, in order to faith, explained the endearing promise, which our Saviour made his disciples in his valedictory address, to have reference altogether to the miraculous influences which were shed down on the memorable Pentecost, in order to avoid a plain assertion in regard to the world "whom the world cannot receive." Will it not do for us to understand, when the Holy Spirit is mentioned, that the Spirit himself is meant; and when "the gifts of the Spirit" are spoken of, that these in very deed are intended; and so, when the "fruits of the Spirit" are named:—or must we be bewildered in distinguishing what and what sort of influences are intended? This seems to me like confounding a person and his actions. I had thought when the Holy Spirit takes up his abode in a human body, he exercises such influences on him, as in his sovereign wisdom, he thinks best, whether of the miraculous or ordinary kind. Some seem to think that "the gift of the Spirit" means not the *Spirit's being given*, but compare it with the spiritual gifts mentioned in 1 Cor. xii. But if there is a difference between the gift of a servant, and the gifts of a servant, there may be a difference between "the gift of the Holy Spirit" and the gifts of the Holy Spirit. By the former expression may be meant the bestowment of a servant, on the part of some donor —by the latter, the bestowment of something by the servant.

I understand the promise spoken of in Acts ii. 39, to allude to the gift of the Holy Spirit mentioned in the preceding verse. Say, do I understand aright in this particular? And, if not, please explain what promise is alluded to. If it be conceded, that it alludes to the gift of the Spirit, just before spoken of, then the promise of this gift, would seem to embrace all the disciples of Jesus in all subsequent time, and in every region.

The discussion now going on between brethren Scott and Winans, just occurs to my mind. The latter seems to me to have fallen into the error, that the Word and the Spirit are the same, or, that the Word is the Spirit, from not making the distinction above suggested, viz— the difference between the influence of the Spirit and the Spirit himself. Indeed, this confounding of terms seems to me to lead to incessant perplexity. The popular preacher before referred to, in a discourse, which I heard him deliver, first contended for the distinct personality of the Spirit; and then in the same discourse, took the liberty of maintaining, that the passage, "Whose heart the Lord opened," &c. showed plainly that the Spirit opened Lydia's heart, to make her believe. Now, thought I, do the Lord and the Spirit mean the same? And, is this in accordance with the idea of the distinct personality of the Spirit? Is not this confounding the Lord and the Spirit?

*Rev. Mr. Hinton.

The subject of the influences of the Holy Spirit, and indeed the Holy Spirit himself, although so much talked about, seems to be very little understood. Those professors of the Christian religion, who have most to say on these matters, seem to think, that Christians are placed on the same footing in regard to the Holy Spirit, as the Jews under the Sinaitic covenant, or institution, although the Christian institution is contradistinguished from the Jewish by being called the "ministration of the Spirit," and its pre-eminence argued from that consideration. I should like to see this distinction between the two institutions examined and pointed out.

Not long since, a sermon was delivered in this neighborhood, on the text, "Strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life; and few there be that find it." I did not hear this discourse, but was informed, that the preacher, after inculcating the idea, that God had made a strait entrance into his kingdom, and a narrow way for his people to travel in, took occasion to say, there were some people, who becoming tired of the narrow road, had set themselves to work, and had made a *turnpike* road for themselves. Now it is at least a question with my mind, whether God has made a turnpike for his people, and whether its narrowness and obstructions have not been made by men. Isaiah speaks of a "highway," which I should think equivalent to a turnpike, a road thrown up high, so as not to be liable to be interrupted by mud holes, &c. In every age, men have had to pass into the kingdom—to squeeze between those who stand in the way to prevent their entrance; and who thus render the gate strait, and after entering they have to encounter many difficulties from the stumbling blocks, which men have thrown in the way. This reminds me of a remark of our friend Philander, some two or three years ago in the Herald, in reference to the views of baptism contained in your Extra No. 1. He said such doctrines would suit the negroes very well, and seemed to apprehend, that numbers of these poor creatures would greedily receive it; and really, at first, knowing their great fondness for immersion, I was somewhat apprehensive, that some of them might catch at it, and conclude, that all that is necessary, is to be immersed. But, sir, experience shows these apprehensions groundless: this gate is so strait, that few of them can press through it. Our friend Philander has, perhaps, (but we ought not to exclude the preacher above alluded to from his share of this work of benevolence, and so we will squeeze him in parenthesis) aided in narrowing or straitening this gate, and has thus prevented them from getting on the turnpike.

The serpent in the garden of Eden, obstructed the way which God made for our first parents, and from that time to the year of our Lord 1834, has been at work to prevent their descendants from travelling in the plain ways of the Lord. Alas! alas! the stumbling blocks, the snares which he has thrown in the way, both of the "little ones" of the Lord, and of the world, by means of sectarianism! The gospel is a declaration of God's love to his poor erring creatures—of peace and good will—of pardon—and an invitation to the miserable

wanderers to return to the bosom of their loving Father. The original preachers had committed to them, "the ministry of reconciliation," which Paul explains thus—"To wit, that God was in Christ Jesus reconciling the world to himself, not imputing their trespasses to them." The gospel carries on its front the offer of pardon, of remission of sins. Men are not called upon by it, to reconcile themselves to God, but to be reconciled to him, and, as an inducement, the free pardon of all their sins is offered. This is the language of the gospel, and the language of reason too on this subject—the only way in which a rebel can become reconciled to his offended sovereign, or be made to love him. But, alas! how is this gospel, this good news to all men, smothered up by the inventions of men. Nowadays mourning benches and altars are thrown in the way of those who would seek, not accept of pardon. O! that the good news of great joy could go forth to all people, divested of all the mysticism, the false colorings, of men

I concur with you in the suggestions made in the last Harbinger, that the public advocates of Christianity often, yea generally, err in taking it for granted, that their hearers are believers. I have long seen this fault. Instead of urging upon them "the demonstrations of the Spirit" to convince them that Jesus of Nazareth is both Lord and Christ—God's Anointed—that to him is given all power, both in heaven and on earth—they go on the supposition, that their auditors are already fully convinced of this fact, when, in reality, the grand desideratum, in this land called Christian, is to produce in the minds of a very large majority of the people, the firm, the solid conviction of the truth of the pretensions of Jesus. That a large majority of the people of this country, will admit, if interrogated, that Jesus is the Son of God, &c. is, I believe, true; but this goes more upon the concurrent say-so of the people with whom they have been conversant, than upon that testimony which alone can give faith. I wish this subject could be urged upon the consideration of the public proclaimers of the gospel in the manner which its importance demands.

INQUIRER.

Reply.

Dear Brother,

MUCH difficulty and embarrassment yet remain in the minds of many of the disciples on the subject of the Holy Spirit, and what is called his "influences." The extravagances of enthusiasm on the one hand, and rationalism on the other, has muddied the waters of the sanctuary, and distracted the minds of the most sincere and devout in their regard for the Living Oracles. Much has been written, and much has been said, by the brethren of the reformation, on this subject; and, although light has been elicited, and is still eliciting, the more thoughtful and inquisitive appear not to be altogether satisfied and quieted on this interesting theme.

Patience in the investigation, openness to conviction, and a freedom from dogmatism are, on all abstruse and difficult questions, and

especially on this cardinal matter, of indispensable importance to the discovery of truth.

We had thought it best, for some time past, to leave this subject, with the various essays written by different persons upon it, to the consideration and reflection of the brethren—especially as the more obvious, important, and practical aspects of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit were, in our judgment, clearly sketched out in reference to the long controversy with the sects on this item of their creeds. And, if I am not greatly deceived in my information, the majority of our brethren are pretty well satisfied, that they have correct and scriptural views of the subject.

There are, indeed, many new converts, and many new readers of our periodicals, whose minds are quite unsettled on the subject; and, as these are often harrassed with the speculations of the day, it may be of use to them occasionally to offer a few remarks, were it only to illustrate, or place in a new attitude, the views which have been excogitated, during the present discussion;—and, perhaps, something may be added even to these, either in the way of illustration, developement, or confirmation.

With many it is an easy matter to investigate and decide every subject. They have only to read a few texts of Scripture and hear a sermon from some popular preacher, and they are quite satisfied they understand the matter perfectly. One decides in favor of this theory, and another in favor of that, after a few days, or sometimes a few hours, reflection, and become as dogmatical as the pope. Others prefer the opinion of some favorite author or creed; and from their conviction of the learning, piety, and talents of those who have thought for them, they are willing to repose in full assurance that they are right, and to denounce all others, as in error who may falter in yielding unquallified assent to their borrowed opinions.

Many, indeed, cannot take comprehensive views of any subject; and if they can only get a hold of a few simple ideas, they have no desire to extend their inquiries or their views on the subject. But there are some restive and inquisitive persons who are always prying into the most abstruse subjects, and are never satisfied till they get to the bottom of a subject, or have pushed their inquiries beyond the *terra firma* of revelation and experience.

For our own part, we are desirous to understand all that God has revealed, and to receive the exact ideas which are couched in the words which the Holy Spirit used.

In attending to the suggestions and inquiries in your letter, I propose to institute a few inquiries and to attempt a scriptural answer to them. Indeed, all that I now propose will be to ascertain *the meaning of the sacred dialect* on the Holy Spirit, and will, therefore, exclude from our phraseology every scholastic term and phrase on this topic. Without farther ceremony we proceed,

1. What is the meaning of the phrase, "*the gift of the Holy Spirit*"?

This phrase is found in the New Testament *twice*—in the Old Testament never. *The gifts of the Holy Spirit* is not a scriptural

phrase, and, therefore, we have nothing to say about it. We have said that the phrase is not found in the Old Testament: the idea is not, therefore, to be sought in that volume. It is a New Testament phrase, and its meaning must be found in the Living Oracles of the Apostles and Evangelists of Jesus Christ.

That we may have clear and certain knowledge on this subject, we shall submit *facts* only.

Fact 1. There are only the *eight* following words found in the approved Greek text, translated *gift* in the common version of the apostolic writings:—*dorea, dorema, doron, doma, dosis, merismos, charis, charisma.*

Dorea occurs eleven times, and is used by Luke, John, and Paul —*dorema* twice, used by Paul and James—*doron* eighteen times, used by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Paul—*doma* four times, used by Matthew, Luke, and Paul—*dosis* once, used by James—*merismos* twice, used by Paul—*charis* occurs more than one hundred and fifty times, and used by Luke, John, Paul, James, Peter and Jude, in the common version mostly *grace.* It is rendered *charity* in the new version two or three times. 2 Cor. viii. *Charisma* is found seventeen times, used by Paul and Peter. Now, of these *doma* and *doron* denote common gifts from man to man, from father to child, or religious sacrificial donations according to the law. But *dorea* and *charisma* are the words which we have now to consider.

Fact 2. When "*spiritual gifts*" are spoken of, no other word is used but *charisma*—that is, where we have the phrase "spiritual gifts" in the common version, we have *charisma* expressed or implied in the Greek.

Hebrews ii. 4, is not an exception, for there it is *distributions*: common version, "gifts"—not "*the* gifts" of the Holy Spirit. The word here is *merismos*, found only twice. Heb. ii. 4, and iv. 12. In the last place it is translated, "dividing assunder"—common version.

Fact 3. *But when the gift of the Holy Spirit is spoken of, or, indeed, alluded to, no other word than* DOREA *is used by any writer who speaks of it.*

Every particular gift of the Spirit spoken of, or alluded to, is designated by *charisma;* but "the gift of the Holy Spirit" by *dorea* only. This is certainly worth something to those who wish to understand the scriptures.

From this last fact the inference may be drawn, that a gift of the Spirit, or a spiritual gift, is not the same as *the gift of the Holy Spirit*, inasmuch as the sacred writers in their language *never confounded them.* Ought we not now to inquire what is the precise import of the words *dorea* and *charisma*?

That the English reader, curious to understand this matter, may be furnished with all the means in his power to understand for himself, we shall now give him, in order, all the passages where these words occur in the original;—and first for *dorea* let him consult John iv. 10. Acts ii. 38. viii. 20. x. 45. xi. 17. Rom. v. 15, 17. 2 Cor. ix. 15. Eph. iii. 7 iv. 7. Heb. vi. 4. From a careful inspection of these pas-

sages, both in the common and new version, he will discover, that this term expresses and denotes the largest, freest, and best bounty of God. To express the bounty of God in its most extensive display over all creation, in the apocryphal book of wisdom, chap. xvi. 25. this word is found;—*he pantatrophos sou dorea*—"thy all nourishing bounty."

Jesus uses it to the woman of Samaria to exalt her conceptions of God's bounty. "If," says he, "you knew the bounty of God"—"*the gift of God.*" *Free gift* is the fullest version of it which our language admits, according to Macknight; but this does not fully express it. It denotes the largest and freest gift of God.

Charisma next deserves our attention. The English reader will examine all the passages in which it is found when he inspects the following:—Rom. i. 11. v. 15, 16. vi. 23. xi. 29. xii. 6. 1 Cor. i. 7. vii. 7. xii. 4, 9, 28, 30, 31. 2 Cor. i. 11. 1 Tim. iv. 14. 2 Tim. i. 6. Pet. iv. 10.

This word has always some *indefinite* favor or gift as its import—a favor or a bounty; and, when used definitely, it is the particular favor or gift before mentioned. It is specific in its import, while *dorea* is rather generic. Hence, prophecy, speaking foreign languages, interpretation of foreign languages, power of working miracles are fully expressed by *charisma*. It might, indeed, be added, that *dorea* respects the bounty from which the gift flows; while *charisma* represents the thing, the favor, or benefit, given. But the splendid bequest, as well as the bounty which freely confers it, are also expressed by this term. Definition goes no farther.

We have this phrase, *the gift of the Holy Spirit*, as has been said, but *twice*, in all the apostolic writings;—Acts ii. 38. and x. 45. both of which denote all that is comprehended in the promise of Joel, the Holy Spirit in all his miraculous powers. It is, indeed, Acts viii. 20. called "the gift (*dorea*) of God;" and that gift, mentioned Acts x. 45. compared with that mentioned, Acts ii. 28. is called by Peter, Acts xi. 17. *ten isen dorean*, the *same gift*.

Although, as has been said, this is the fulfilment of the prophecy of Joel, it is also represented as the *Holy Spirit himself*. See Acts viii. 15, 17, 19. from which it is very evident that, in the judgment of Peter, John, and Simon, this gift was regarded as the Holy Spirit himself; and is also called "the gift of God."

From all which the following conclusion is inevitable, that the phrase, "the gift of the Holy Spirit," means the Holy Spirit himself *given*, as foretold by Joel, and vouchsafed to Jews and Gentiles at the erection of the kingdom of the Messiah, and on their admission into it. But a question may here arise concerning what influences, or divine powers, the Holy Spirit displayed on the bodies, souls, and spirits of those who received this gift, or in whom he made his abode. But of this in our next.

EDITOR.

PHILADELPHIA, *January* 14, 1834.

To the Editor and Publishing Committee of the Religious Narrator.

Gentlemen,

I AM sorry to complain, and it especially grieves me to think I have, with others, just cause of complaint against any thing that appears under the auspices of the "Central Union of Independent Baptist Churches." I was a warm advocate and promoter of that Union, and however feeble and inefficient my endeavors have been, they have been sincere and zealous; for I had long seen the necessity of some rallying point, around which the friends of Jesus, in our denomination, might concentrate their energies; and from which they might go forth "to the help of the Lord against the mighty," in the spirit of that benevolent, liberal, and enlightened sentiment which distinguishes the brethren of the Union from those dogmatical, vindictive, and narrow-minded bigots who would limit the Holy One, and who seem to consider themselves the exclusive favorites of Heaven.

You very well know how many evil things have been spoken and written against us, falsely and maliciously, by those who have considered us a little *too fast* in the work of the Lord. And shall we, my brethren, be guilty of the same conduct towards others whom some among *us* think *too fast!* I hope not.

Allow me, then, to notice an article which appeared in the official organ of our "Union," under date of January 3, 1834, in the editorial column.

These are but a few of the things I have against you, to which I call your attention at the present time, believing, as I do, that the "*confident, assuming*, and *self sufficient*" spirit which the whole article breathes, must carry conviction to the mind of every unprejudiced person, that the writer indulged in a very "*bad gratification*" while penning those gratuitous opinions of those, who, to say the least, never "*wiped their feet on his carpets.*"

How much better would it have been for those who consider themselves set for the defence of the truth, while error was being propagated, to have manfully resisted its inroads, and prevented the "*infusion of that bad leaven into some of our churches,*" which the writer so much deprecates, and on the "*expulsion, suppression*, and *extermination,*" of which he so earnestly and dictatorily insists. Surely, he must have imagined himself in the pontifical chair, rather than among independent republican Baptists, who have the right (and will exercise it) to hear and judge for themselves.

It is one thing, brethren, to accuse and fulminate, but quite another to sustain an accusation, and to enforce an anathema. And it is to be hoped that if any of us are suspected to be laboring under the "*cankerous working*" of this "*bad leaven,*" (of which too it seems there can be "*no doubt,*") we shall be furnished with some capital recipe for its cure and eradication before we are entirely turned over to Satan.

That "there are some amongst us who confidently affirm" certain things alleged, may be true for any thing I know, the writer having a far more extensive acquaintance in the community than I profess to have. But I have yet to learn from the word of God, that Christian congregations are wrong in holding the "*dogmas of the Apostles*"—in insisting on "*baptism for the remission of sins*"—and in attending to the "*weekly breaking of the loaf of blessing,*" or the Lord's Supper, as it is generally called.

If I remember right, the "little book" in such high esteem among our orthodox brethren, teaches "baptism for the remission of sins;" and I distinctly recollect that brother Brantly once said to me in relation to the weekly administration of the Lord's Supper in one of our churches, "*I give you credit. I believe that the Apostles always attended to it on every first day of the week, if not oftener.*"

If the writer had allusion to the brethren in Bank street, (I know of no others amongst us,) I can say, that when it has been my privilege to worship

with them, no "new version" of the New Testament was used by the venerable and learned Elder William Ballantine; and I also testify that he invariably used the Old Testament. It is not their practice, however, to dogmatize much on single texts. Hundreds, I think, can testify, if they fear not the Vatican, that brother Brantly frequently, on taking a text, *gives a new version of it, and preaches from his own rendering*. So much for this insinuated heresy.

Who will undertake to show that the New Version is not to be depended on?

I confidently and fearlessly challenge the writer, or any other person, to prove that those he has been pleased to call pseudo-restorers, believe that "baptism is the only regeneration," in the popular theological sense of the term *regeneration*.

As I had the happiness to be able to put myself in the way of the "*late illumination*," and having had from the beginning the temerity to make myself acquainted with the writings of that "*professed restorer*" alluded to, I do most unhesitatingly avow my conviction that not one single truth or fact of the gospel, as taught by him, can be disproved. Mere contradictions and cavillings, evil reports and inuendoes, can have no other effect than to recoil on those who so profusely bestow them; and they will find soonor or later that their "*violent dealing will come down on their own pates.*"

I believe with the writer, that "*there is good sense enough,*" at least in Philadelphia, "*to see through the flimsy pretences*" of the philippics we have been noticing; and that having heard for themselves, they will, like the noble Bereans, have courage to try every spirit by the word of God, whereby they will be able to discriminate and choose the right. The Father of our spirits has every where in his word addressed himself to *our* "*reason,*" and certainly we may believe him to be wiser than any earthly Doctor. He taught a Prophet to say, "Come, let us reason together;" and an Apostle, instructed by the same Spirit, writes, "According to his mercy he saved us, by *the washing of regeneration*, and the renewing of the Holy Spirit."

Having, I believe, laid the most of your missiles at your own door, I will, for the present, desist, lest I may be charged with "*insolence*" for choosing to differ with the powers that be.

Hoping you will hear us before the knife of excision is applied, and will at least attempt to point out the errors we have imbibed and endeavor to convince us of them, I will leave you to your own reflections.

In the hope of immortal life,
Your aggrieved, but forgiving brother,

J. L. RHEES.

[This was refused admission into the Narrator. Ed.]

Six Methodistic Presumptions against Immersion.

New Alexandria, *Ohio*, March 8, 1834.

Dear Brother,

HAVING had lately put into my hands a book, titled, "Theological Institutes; or, A View of the Evidences, Doctrines, Morals and Institutions of Christianity—by *Richard Watson*;" published from New York, by the Editor of the *Christian Advocate*—I extract and send some of the author's remarks upon Christian immersion.

This work holds a conspicuous place among the classic authors of Methodistic theology. It is a work to which your friend Mr. Waterman is much indebted for his views of Christian immersion and sundry other topics relative to Christianity.

Believing that you have not seen this very popular work, and that you would be pleased to have exhibited another instance of the peerless majesty of Truth when attacked by the puerile arguments of men highly renowned for their skill in interpreting the Living Oracles, permit me to give you, in

brief, his views on that trite subject, Christian Immersion, with regard to "*the mode*," as he is pleased to call it.

The writer appears much displeased and quite out of temper with the advocates for Christian immersion, styling them "troublesome men to their fellow-Christians, who unsettle weak minds, and some times, perhaps from their zeal for a form, endanger their own spirituality." The cause of his displeasure appears to be that men would contend so tenaciously for a mere circumstance, a comparative trifle, that has produced so much controversy and excited greater feeling than it is in any view entitled to. But for all this, not one single fact does he adduce from the New Testament against that for which they contend and are so "troublesome to their fellow-Christians." In the absence of fact, however, he arrays six formidable presumptions, with which he would confute all such advocates and frown out of existence, or, at least out of the polite and more decent part of society, that indecent, but, in our view, most becoming and significant institution, Christian immersion. You shall now have, *verbatim*, his six presumptions:—

1. It is not probable, that if immersion were the only allowable mode of baptism, it should not have been expressly enjoined.

2. It is not probable, that in a religion designed to be universal, a mode of administering this ordinance should be obligatory, the practice of which is ill adapted to many climates, where it would either be exceedingly harsh to immerse the candidates, male and female, strong and feeble, in water; or in some places, as in the higher latitudes, for a part of the year, impossible. Even if immersion were in fact the original mode of baptizing in the name of Christ, these reasons make it improbable that no accommodation of the form should take place without vitiating the ordinance. This some of the stricter Baptists assert, although they themselves depart from the primitive mode of partaking of the Lord's supper, in accommodation to the customs of their country.

3. It is still more unlikely, that in a religion of mercy there should be no consideration of health and life in the administration of an ordinance of salvation, since it is certain that in countries where cold bathing is little practised, great risk of both is often incurred, especially in the case of women and delicate persons of either sex, and fatal effects do sometimes occur.

4. It is also exceedingly improbable, that in such circumstances of climate, and the unfrequent use of the bath, a mode of baptizing should have been adopted or appointed, which, from the shivering, the sobbing, and other bodily uneasiness produced, should distract the thoughts and unfit the mind for a collected performance of a religious and solemn act of devotion.

5. It is highly improbable that the three thousand converts at the Pentecost, who, let it be observed, were baptized on the same day, were all baptized by immersion; or that the Jailor and "all his" were baptized in the same manner, *in the night*, although the Baptists have invented a tank, or bath, in the prison at Philippi, for that purpose.

6. And finally, it is most of all improbable that a religion like the Christian, so scrupulously delicate, should have enjoined the immersion of women by men, and in the presence of men. In an after age when immersion came into fashion, baptisteries, and rooms for women, and changes of garments and other conveniencies of this practice came into use, because they were found necessary to decency: but there could be no such conveniencies in the first instance; and accordingly we hear of none. With all the arrangements of modern times, baptism by immersion is not a decent practice. There is not a female, perhaps, who submits to it, who has not a great previous struggle with her delicacy; but that, at a time when no such accommodations could be had as have since been found necessary, such a ceremony should have been constantly performed wherever the Apostles and first preachers went, and that at pools and rivers, in the presence of many spectators, and they sometimes unbelievers and scoffers, is a thing not rationally credible."

These may be truly styled Watson's Six Presumptions against Christian

Immersion. You have doubtless found these to be the chief arguments urged by every Methodist against the institution.

The above work is now stereotyped, and contains almost 450 large octavo pages, each page divided into two columns. The impression is most beautiful, and is one size less than that of your pocket form edition of the New Testament, and sold at two dollars per copy, and is widely circulated, and must be read and studied by every one who would become a Methodist Clergyman.

A. W. C.

A good rule works always two ways at least.

Faith and Immersion are both exploded by the same six Presumptions.

1. IT is not probable, that if *believing* were the only allowable mode of faith, it should not have been expressly enjoined.

2. It is not probable, that in a religion designed to be universal, a mode of believing should be obligatory, the practice of which is ill adapted to those who have no ears, or, having ears, cannot hear, because of mental imbecility or physical incapacity; and in all cases, for a part of human life impossible, and in that part of human life in which a very large proportion of the human family die.

3. It is still more unlikely, that in a religion of mercy there should be no consideration of spiritual health and life in the appointment of a condition of salvation: since it is certain, that in countries where preaching and reading is little practised, great risk of both is often incurred, especially in the case of infants, insane persons, and those born deaf and dumb, and fatal effects do sometimes occur, which could not occur if spiritual health and life could be enjoyed without believing in order to faith.

4. It is also exceedingly improbable, that in such circumstances, and in the unfrequent use of preaching and reading, a mode of believing and repenting should have been adopted, which, from the sighing and sobbing, and other bodily uneasiness produced through conviction of the truth and sin in believing the testimony of God, should distract the thoughts and unfit the mind for a collected performance of a religious and solemn act of devotion.

5. It is improbable, that the immense multitude of every kindred, tribe, and tongue, which John saw in heaven, could ever have got there, if believing in order to faith and repentance was necessary; for there are and have been kindreds, tribes, and tongues that never heard the word to be believed in order to spiritual health and life.

6. And, finally, it is most of all improbable, that a religion like the Christian, so scrupulously delicate, should have enjoined that ladies should have been told by gentlemen of all the sins of fornication, adultery, and uncleaness in the presence of gentlemen too, of which their delicate sex had been guilty in order to their believing and repenting of sin, to the salvation of their souls. Any mode of believing and repenting, which requires these dear angels to hear such indelicate things, cannot be a part of a religion so scrupulously delicate. In after times, when believing and repenting came into fashion, nun-

neries, and private rooms for women and female preachers, and changes of words, and other accommodations suited to this harsh and indelicate thing of hearing of sins and reading the Old and New Testaments, came into fashion.

This is a *fair*, though a *new*, version of the six Methodistic presumptions and probabilities—and I leave it to the good sense of the reader to decide whether six presumptions make one proof—and if they do, whether we cannot presume both faith, repentance, and immersion out of existence by the same modes of reasoning.

No man of learning and candor can, in the face of this generation, say, that immersion is not commanded; nor can he, by any mode of reasoning, find even a probability that one infant or adult was sprinkled—(and no one pretends that it was commanded) by Jesus or his Apostles.

EDITOR

Catholic Controversy.

No. 4.

FAITH, in the ambiguous style of religious controversy, means opinion, doctrine, knowledge, belief, as the case may be, or the exigencies may require. In right reason, and according to the Bible, it means truth testified, and the belief of it. "The faith once delivered to the saints" is the truth testified by the saints;—*that truth believed is our faith.*

RULE is measure, law, reason; the rule of manners is moral law; the rule of faith is testimony; the rule of reason is evidence of the same nature and kind with the objects of reason.

We have tried the controversy of Messrs. Hughes and Breckinridge about "*the rule of faith*" by the fair import of the word *rule*, and the word *faith*, and have shown how easy the question about *the rule of faith* might have been determined, had the gentlemen defined their terms, and spoken in accordance with the dictionary and grammar of our mother tongue.

In the conclusion of our last essay, we promised a few remarks upon "*the rule of faith*" in their appropriated sense of that word, as equivalent to *an authoritative judge.* Rule, indeed, is sometimes equivalent to law, and law supposes a lawgiver and a judge. When, then, these gentlemen speak of a rule of faith "*to settle disputes in the church of Christ,*" (I use their own words) they obviously mean a judge of controversy about doctrine. In this style their faith means *doctrine*, and rule means *judge*. And what is the doctrine in the church to be judged, and who is the judge of it?

The doctrine is *the meaning* of all scripture; every one's opinion or view of the written word. This is the popular acceptation of this word doctrine. Disputes, then, are supposed to be *in the church* about the meaning of the scriptures by both the Catholic and Protestant heroes. Yes, in the true church. (Where, then, is its infallibility?—!)

Disputes among infallibles is of the nature of fallible-infallibility. But it is agreed by Messrs. Hughes and Breckinridge, that there are disputes in the church of God—I say it is *agreed*. Their second rule, signed by both their hands, is published in the following words, to wit; "2. The parties agree, (mark this word *agree*,) that there is an infallible rule of faith established by Christ, to guide us in matters of religion, for the purpose of determining disputes in the church of Christ." Disputes about faith, or about doctrine, (for they are synonmous with these gentlemen) are then acknowledged to exist in the infallible church. This, in my optics, according to my logic, concedes the whole matter in debate on the part of Mr. Hughes, and yet Mr. Breckinridge seems not to have noticed it!

It is impossible to deny that there have been disputes in the infallible church of Rome, for all its history is a history of controversies and sins. But what comes of its pretentions to infallibility! The church is a unit. The true church is one and indivisible, and includes all the visible society of Christians, as Mr. Hughes defines it. Letter 5. p. 45. (Bird's edition,) "By the church," says Mr. Hughes, "I understand that visible society of Christians, composed of the people who are taught, and the pastors who teach, by virtue of a certain divine commission, recorded in the 28th chapter of St. Matthew, addressed to the Apostles and their legitimate successors, until the end of the world."

To talk of the infallibility of pastors, of the pope, of a council, or of both of these combined, and to agree that a part of the church is fallible, and may have disputes about doctrine—is, to me, as ridiculous as the pretensions of the philosopher who said he had an infallble understanding, but his tongue and hands would not obey its dictates. An infallible head, with a fallible tongue, hands, and feet, exhibits a very reverend infallible personage.

But Mr. Hughes contends that disputes about discipline, and disputes about doctrine, are very different things—that error in discipline is not at all incompatible with infallibility in doctrine. This is, indeed, a flimsy salvo, for the world is more interested in discipline than in doctrine; and an infallible understanding, dwelling in a flagitious character, or a good pope in a wicked man, is the climax of monstrosity. But as every one can judge of behavior, and but few of doctrine, it is essential to the defence of popery that Mr. Hughes concedes the fallibility of the church in discipline, while he stands up for an infallible judge of controversies, to determine disputes in the church.

But the question recurs, what is the doctrine in the church to be judged?;—the doctrine of opinion, of sentiment, or the doctrine of behaviour or of discipline! Not the latter; for there is no infallible judge of discipline, but there is an infallible judge of these disputes about the doctrine of opinion or of sentiment. "Besides *doctrines, articles of faith*, and morals, which are *immutable*, there is *discipline*," says Mr. Hughes, "for which infallibility is neither claimed nor necessary," p. 52. Take for an example—"I believe in the holy

Catholic church." This is an article of faith; (It is well that faith is the evidence of things not seen; for where is the object of this faith!) this is taught to every Catholic child. After the Lord's prayer, and the "hail Mary," it repeats, "I believe in the holy Catholic church." From four years to four-score this child repeats, "I believe in the holy Catholic church," without ever knowing the meaning of the word *believe*, *holy*, *catholic*, or *church*. The meaning of these words is *doctrine*, a particular view of them is *opinion*, and the government or economics of this holy Catholic church is *discipline*; for *the faith*, *the doctrine*, and *the morals* infallibility is claimed; but for *the opinion* and *the discipline* infallibility is neither claimed nor argued. Such are the disputes in the church which are to be determined by "the infallible rule of faith," the authoritative judge of controversy.

Our next question is, Who is the infallible judge? Mr. Hughes responds, "A GENERAL COUNCIL." p. 76. "*Every definition of doctrine and morals by a general council is infallible.*" "*But*," he adds, "*no council is general or œcumenical without the* POPE'S *concurrence.* Consequently the spiritual empire of Christ is not *divided* in the Catholic church." I would have asked Mr. Hughes, just at this place, Has ever a general council defined the word *doctrine?* I would thank him for an infallible definition of it. I know of no single definition of so much importance to all christendom in reference to this controversy.

A general council, then, is the rule of faith, or the authoritative judge of disputes in the church! The pope and the clergy are only a part of the church, according to Mr. Hughes, and their definition is infallible. A dispute in the church supposes parties—an impartial judge should belong to neither party; but an infallible judge may belong to one, and here he must belong to both. Now if the parties are both fallible, and neither of their judgments as parties infallible, how can the addition of two fallibles, when brought into one council, make one infallible judgment or definition!! A dispute about "extreme unction" existed before the council of Trent. There were two parties; each had its own definition. A general council assembles. The two fallible definitions are added together, or a part of the two is compounded, and the error is extracted in the new organization. Hence, the definition is pronounced infallible.

But unfortunately for the whole argument, the definition is after all to be interpreted and understood by each one for himself, as was the Bible before the council met: or else each must implicitly receive, without examination, the definition, as the infant received the command of its mother to repeat, "I believe in the holy Catholic church."

But having heard so much of the infallible rule of faith, which Mr. Hughes has to propose to the American people, the reader may be curious to hear him offer his proof, "That Jesus Christ did establish the Catholic rule of faith," and create an infallible judge to determine disputes in the infallible church. Mr. Hughe's first and chief argument is in the words following:—"Go ye, therefore, *teach all*

nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; *teaching them* to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you and, behold, I will be with you aldays, even to the consummation of the world," Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. on which he observes, p. 46, 47, 48.

"I. In the commission referred to above, *all nations* and *all days*, even to the end of the world, *are included*. Therefore, the fulfilment of the Saviour's injunction required that the Apostles should have *successors* in the ministry of "teaching;" since the term of human life, which remained to them, bore no proportion to the *extent of the "commission,"* which was limited only by the boundaries of the *universe*—"all nations"—and of time—"all days, *even to the consummation of the world.*" I defy you, Rev. Sir, to detect *error*, either in the premises or conclusion of this reasoning."—

"Besides the "*commission to teach,*" the Son of God has declared to the same effect, "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another comforter, that he may abide with you FOREVER, the Comforter which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name: He shall *teach you all things*, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said to you." John xiv. 16, 26. "He, that heareth you, heareth me." Luke x. 16. In the same manner has he pledged *his veracity*, that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against his church"—that, "He himself will abide with it FOREVER"—and St. Paul tells us, that "faith comes by HEARING, and hearing by the word of God"—and that Christ has "given some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, some *pastors* and *teachers*, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry." Eph. iv. 11. The same Apostle elsewhere says of the church, that it is "the pillar and ground of truth." Will you, then, Rev. Sir, impugn the veracity of the Saviour, by asserting, that when, in these texts, he said "*forever*," *he* MEANT only "till the death of the last Apostle"?—

"The next evidence I shall produce in support of the Catholic rule of faith, and against the Protestant principle, is derived from a source, which I am sure you will respect. It is the doctrine and practice of your own church, laid down in the Westminister Confession.

"The first is the *Baptism of* INFANTS, sanctioned by the "teaching" of the Pastors of the Church, but certainly not susceptible of proof by any text of Scripture. (Page 159.) The second is the violation of the Sabbath, commanded by God to be sanctified, (Exodus xx. 8.) and the substitution of Sunday, *without the* AUTHORITY *of any single text of Scripture;* but in accordance with the constant "*teaching*" of the Pastors of the Church. (Page 132.) The third is, in the mutual *promises* exacted both from the *minister* and the *congregation* in the ceremony of ordaining, when the former is *obliged* to promise "*submission* to the discipline of the church," and the latter, both "OBEDIENCE and *submission* unto the new minister, as having RULE OVER THEM *in the Lord.*" (Page 590.) Is there any scriptural *evidence* to show that St. Paul required such promises, from either Titus or Timothy, previous to ordination? I use this not as an argument, but rather as a commentary; which, considering its *source* is no small compliment to the Catholic rule of faith, at the expense of your own. I may add also, that in the year 1729, the Synod of Philadelphia passed an act, called the "adopting act," by which not only candidates, but professed ministers, were "*obliged*" to adopt the Westminister Confession, as *containing* the summary of the scriptural doctrine,—by way, I suppose, of proving the *sufficiency* of the "Bible ALONE; interpreted by each individual for himself." (See Dr. Miller's 2d and 6th letters to Presbyterians.)

"My first conclusion, then, is, that the Catholic rule of faith *was instituted by Christ;* that it is the rule, which prevailed, except among the deluded votaries of heresy, in all the former ages of the Christian church—and finally, that it is the principle to which the Presbyterians are *obliged* to have RECOURSE on

a variety of occasions. The reader, of course, must judge, whether facts and reasoning authorize this first conclusion."

That the reader may also perceive the strength of Mr. Breckinridge in oppugning the above reasoning, before we comment on either, we shall let the reader have his reply. [p. 59, 60, 61, 65, 66:]—

"Having laid down your rule of faith, you proceed to prove that it was established by Christ, by an appeal to the apostolical commission given Matth. xxviii. 17—20. The reader will please refer to it. Allow me here to put by the side of this, those passages which, added to it, make out the commission in full. "And these signs shall follow them that believe; in my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues." "They shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover." Mark xvi. 17, 18. "And ye are witnesses of these things."—"And behold I send the promise of my Father upon you; but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem until ye be endowed with power from on high." Luke xxiv. 48, 49. "But ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto me, both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth." Acts i. 8.

"Now we freely grant that the above passages confer a commission on the Apostles; and that they were divinely endowed, for the discharge of the great work which was given them to do."———

"Now what was it that constituted an Apostle? 1. No man could be an Apostle who had not been *an eye-witness* to Christ's person and works. [See Luke i. 2. and 2 Peter i. 16.] Paul says, 1 Corinthians ix. 1. "Am I not an Apostle? Have I not seen the Lord?" [See Acts i. 21, 22, and x. 41.] 2. An Apostle *must receive his mission directly from Christ,* not by any human ordination. For this reason, Christ appeared to Paul visibly on his way to Damascus, and called him to the work of an Apostle; and this is what Paul means when he says, "Last of all he (Christ) was seen of me, as of one born out of due time." 1 Corinthians xv. 8. 3. Every Apostle had *miraculous* and *extraordinary endowments,* such as inspiration, making him *infallible;* the gift of tongues; power to work miracles, (Mark xvi. 17, 18.) and to impart that power to others, (2 Cor. xii, 12.) The Apostles were told (Acts i. 8.) to wait at Jerusalem for these supernatural gifts; and on the day of Pentecost they were accordingly furnished from on high by the miraculous and extraordinary effusions of the Holy Ghost. By these endowments they were enabled to speak at once many languages; to write inspired books; to cast out devils; raise the dead, &c. 4. Every Apostle, as the name *(one sent)* signifies, and as the terms of the commission plainly show, was to go all abroad, with plenary authority; not to be stationary; or make his permanent seat any where, exclusively. Now it is obvious that the Apostles had no successors in these respects. It was impossible *after* the generation, in which Christ lived, had passed away, that the Apostles could have *such* successors; for it was necessary to their office and work *to have seen the Lord.* But this the second generation could not have done. It is plain also that such a succession was never designed by our Lord, or attempted by the Christians of the next age. It is true that *Judas* had a successor; but it was before the Apostles were fully endued by the Spirit and sent forth. And if *any* were to have successors, why not *all,* as well as *one?* Why not James at Jerusalem, John at Ephesus, and Paul at Antioch, as well as Peter at Rome? Why *Rome* more than eleven other cities? Will not all the texts you have quoted apply as well to James at Jerusalem as to Peter at Rome? Had he not the promise of the same *Holy Spirit* to guide him as Peter? Is not John called "a pillar," (Gal. ii. 9.) as well as Peter? Why do you single out *infallibility* for your succession, and leave out all *other* qualifications? It is curious to remark how you omit even a *reference* to Mark xvi. 17, 18, where the gift of miracles is so inseparably

united to the office of an Apostle. You must admit, then, that there *are some respects* in which the Apostles had no successors. But if *some things* are wanting, your argument is vain. If *some things* are wanting, may not one of them be infallibility? And if *all the other* superhuman endowments ceased, why should infallibility continue? The conclusion is irresistible, that the Apostles had no successors, endued with extraordinary powers of any kind; and therefore the Roman Catholic rule of faith was not established by Christ.

"But yet we hold to a commission still standing and binding, which reaches to the close of time; we believe in a visible catholic (not Roman) church, to which appertain the ministry, the oracles, and ordinances of God; which is to continue to the end of the world—to which the Holy Spirit is promised as an abiding gift; against which the gates of hell shall not prevail; and which is at last to fill the world. Of this church Jesus Christ is the only head; and the Holy Spirit speaking in the Bible, the only infallible rule of faith."——

"Your objections on the points of infant baptism, the change of the Sabbath, and the practices of our church as to the pastoral relation, surely have little to do with the rule of faith. The first and second come appropriately under the subject of tradition, on which you yet are silent. I will here only say that we find satisfactory proof for all the three practices in the word of God, or we would discard them. We reject not testimony which sustains our doctrines, (not opinions) but we look not to "*unwritten tradition*" for their support; and "if the candlestick of the Roman angel were removed to-morrow," we lose not a jot of *proof* on any subject, except that of the *depravity of man*. But more of this hereafter, when, Providence permitting, we hope to satisfy you in still further defending and illustrating the true rule of faith, i. e. *the Holy Spirit speaking in the Bible.*"

Mr. Hughes evidently felt the force of this reasoning, and, indeed, can only shield himself behind the following covert, drawn from Mr. Breckinridge himself, (p. 74:)—

"When we hear you asserting that the "Apostles had no successors," would it not be proper that some one should move at the next General Assembly, that the following article *be expunged* from the Westminster Confession of Faith:—

"To these (church officers) *the keys of the kingdom of heaven* are committed, by virtue whereof *they have power to retain and remit sins, to shut that kingdom against the impenitent*, both by the word and censure; and to *open* it unto penitent sinners by the ministry of the gospel, and by *absolution* from censures, as occasion shall require." chap. xxx. art. 21. page 166.

"These are modest pretensions for gentlemen who assert that the Apostles had no successors. Now I had always thought that these same keys belonged to St. Peter and his successors. I know by whom and to whom they were originally given, and to whom they still belong, if *priority of title* and *possession* be admitted. But as Mr. Breckinridge had informed me that the Apostles had no successors, I was at a loss to imagine what had become of the "keys"—until, peeping into the "Confession of Faith," I learned to my great edification, that they had been *miraculously* discovered at WESTMINSTER, *England*, in the year of our Lord 1647, and graciously fastened, by act of Parliament, to the belt of the Presbyterian Church!"

The reader now has before him the full strength of the Catholic defence of his "infallible rule of faith;" and the full strength of Mr. Hughes' argument against it; on which we must defer our remarks for another month.

EDITOR.

Modern Gospel Dogmas.

"We believe no sinner ever repented without the Spirit was first given him unsought."

"We believe that every sinner can repent."

"The personal and effectual influences of the Spirit are bestowed on the elect *unsought*, which *induced* them to *attend* to the offers of mercy made in Christ, and to accept of them; which influences are not vouchsafed to any but those who were the objects of the eternal and personal election in Christ their head, and constitute the "effectual calling" so continually spoken of by all sound divines, in olden time." These dogmas are found in a reply to "A Novice"—page 29, Religious Herald, Richmond, March 7.

WE believe that every sinner *can repent* without the aid of the Spirit, and that *no sinner ever did repent* without the aid of the Spirit, and that this aid is always *unsought* by the sinner, and, if sought by the sinner, never could be obtained. This is in one sentence the gospel of the Herald on the subject of the conversion of sinners. It requires a good deal of dexterity in the art of religious legerdemain to unmystify this consolatory and practical doctrine of repentance.

With such wholesome doctrines the good Baptists of Virginia are now fed by their present shepherds.

EDITOR.

Address to the Brethren of the Reformation.

NO. II.

THE gospel of the Holy Spirit is most acceptable to many of our contemporaries. They seem to rejoice in the notion that no man can either believe or repent until the Spirit descends upon him as upon the rising Lord when he came up from Jordan. This Spirit, when he pleases, and not until he pleases, unasked and unsolicited, works faith in the heart by a sovereign display of creative power, as when God raised the dead body of Jesus from the tomb. Until the sinner becomes the subject of this miraculous energy, he can no more believe the popular gospel according to Calvin and Wesley, than he can create a world. So enraptured are many with this gospel, that they are prepared to exclude from all their Christian charities any one who contends that the testimony which God has given of his Son, confirmed by the gift of the Holy Spirit, is *credible* and worthy of all acceptation, or that any one, without a miracle in himself, can believe it.

The tendency of this gospel is to seal the sepulchre in which all natural men are dead and buried in trespasses and sins. When the voice that awaked Lazarus from the sleep of death enters their dead ears, they are made alive and come forth into the light of life. But to exhort, persuade, and entreat such to be reconciled to God, is like preaching to the dead; hence it is done with views and feelings similar to those that influenced Ezekiel preaching to the dry bones in the Valley of Vision, while he waited for the breath of God to mingle with his breath in re-animating the dead.

To this gospel, as held forth by many of our contemporaries, is to be attributed the apathy displayed by many of our brethren in the use of means for converting the world:—"Conversion is God's work"—"God works without

means as well as by them"—"His gospel is without money and price"—"Salvation is of grace," are magic phrases with the indolent and avaricious. They are as useful as Franklin's maxims in his Way to Wealth. Yet in things pertaining to this life, men feel that they can do something, and are up and doing, making use of all means to fill their storehouses and cellars with the necessaries and comforts of this life. While they are constrained to admit and acknowledge that God makes one bushel ten, and causes the seed to grow, they have no idea of reaping without sowing, nor of gathering without planting. The gospel of the wind, the rain, and the sunshine, whatever may be its essential doctrines, and however firmly and rationally held, is not incompatible with all industry, economy, and perseverance. That some sow, but do not reap; plant, but do not gather; build, but do not inhabit, abates neither the enterprize nor the zeal of the most speculative Calvinist or fatalist in our country. While many such are expecting eternal life as a free gift after death, they are unwilling that their present health, wealth, and comfort should rest upon the same conditions as those upon which they have suspended their hope of immortality.

Now, brethren, wherein do we excel? What are we doing for the salvation of our families, fellow-citizens, the world?

That there have been, and still are, many amongst us, who not only *pray* for these high objects, but spend much time, money, and labor for them, we do with great pleasure admit; and would to God that we could say this of all who profess the primitive faith and worship!

Among the primitive disciples we admit that there were many who were not conspicuous for their liberality, zeal, and labor in the work of converting the world; nor for their liberality, affection, and diligence in brotherly kindness to their brethren But for this they were not commended by the Apostles, nor will they be commended by the Lord. If Paul spake by, or in accordance with the mind of Christ, we are sure that those he commended on account of excellence in these labors for saints and sinners, will be commended by the Lord when he makes up his jewels.

The following list of services rendered by private citizens is placed to the credit of the ancient disciples, and recorded for our admonition:—

1. Direct contributions in money or property, for the wants of those who labored in the word and teaching.

2. Direct contributions of the same kind for the poor saints, for widows, and other objects of sympathy.

3. Hospitality to strangers, to individual brethren, to the servants of the churches, and to congregations.

4. Personal labor in the way of travelling with, assisting, comforting, and aiding the proclaimers of the word.

5. Taking care of the families and ministering to the wants of those who devote themselves to the Lord.

Under these general heads perhaps may be comprehended all that belong *in common to every disciple*, according to his ability and opportunity: for who he was to labor and practise industry and economy, as much as for the supply of his own individual wants or for those of his own family. Scattered over the face of the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles, we will find abundant evidence of all this.

Will any one, doubtful of this, diligently examine and compare the following passages and references in the connexions in which they stand? "Distribution was made to every man as he had need." Acts iv. 35. "And all the widows stood by him weeping, and showing the coats and mantles which Dorcas made while she was with them." ix. 39. "Peter called them in and *entertained* them." x. 23. "Moreover, these six brethren *accompanied me*." xi. 12. "And the church in Jerusalem sent out Barnabas, that he should go as far as Antioch"—"And he went to Tarsus to seek Saul; and when he found him he brought him to Antioch." xi. 22—25. "Then the disciples (in Antioch) *every man* according to his ability, determined to send relief to the brethren

that dwelt in Judea, which they did, and sent it to the elders, by the hand of Barnabas and Paul." xi. 29, 30. "The church in Antioch sent Barnabas and Saul and others with him, to the Apostles and elders in Jerusalem. They were brought forward on their journey *by the congregation.*" xv. 2, 3. "The Apostles, elders, and *the congregation* in Jerusalem sent *chosen men* from among themselves—men of principal account among the brethren, *writing by their hand* these things." xv. 23. "If you have judged me faithful to the Lord, *enter into my house and continue there. And she compelled us.*" xvi. 15. The immersed Jailor "brought them into his house; he *spread the table* before them." He also washed their stripes." xvi. 33, 34. "The brethren in Thessalonica immediately sent away Paul and Silas by night to Berea." xvii. 10. The brethren in Berea sent away Paul. xvii. 13. Paul and Aquila and Priscilla were tent-makers by trade, and they labored together in Corinth, and Paul continued with them eighteen months. xviii. 1—11. "And when Apollos intended to go from Ephesus to Achaia, the brethren in Ephesus wrote to the disciples exhorting them to receive him." xviii 27. Paul sent two of them who *ministered to him*, viz. Timothy and Erastus, into Macedonia from Ephesus. xix. 22. And there accompanied Paul from Greece, Sopater the Berean, as far as Asia; and of the Thessalonians, Aristarchus and Secundus, and Gaius of Derbe, and Timothy; and of the Asiatics, Tychicus and Trophemus. xx. 4—6. "I have," says Paul to the Ephesian elders, "ministered to myself with my own hands, and *to those who were with me.*" xx. 34. "And some of the disciples also from Cesarea went along with us, and *brought us* to Mnason, a Cyprian, an old disciple, *with whom we should lodge.* And when we arrived at Jerusalem the brethren received us with pleasure." xxi. 17. "And in Rome Paul continued two whole years in his own hired house, and received all who came to him." Acts xxviii. 30.

"Receive Phebe in the Lord, our sister, a deaconess of the congregation in Cenchrea, *as becomes saints; assist her* in whatever business she may have need of you; for, indeed, she has been *a helper of many*, and especially of me." "Salute Priscilla and Aquila, my *fellow-laborers* in Christ. I and *all the Gentile congregations* give them thanks. Salute Mary who *labored much for us.*" "Salute Persis who labored much in the Lord. Gaius my *host*, and the host of *the whole congregation*, salutes you." Rom. chap. xvi. throughout.

"Have we not liberty to lead about a sister wife, as all the other Apostles, and to forbear working? Who serves in the war at his own charges? Who plants a vineyard, and does not eat of the fruit of it? Or who feeds a flock, and does not eat of the milk of the flock?" 1 Cor. ix. "The family of Stephanas have devoted themselves to *the ministering of the saints.*" "They and Fortunatus and Achaicus have supplied your deficiency, have refreshed my spirit and yours; therefore, acknowledge such persons." 1 Cor. xv.

But we cannot transcribe all the New Testament. The command is, "Let him that is taught in the word communicate to him that teaches in all good things"—"Let the seniors who labor in the word and teaching, be counted worthy of a liberal maintenance." "Do not muzzle the ox treading out the corn." "We ought to be joint laborers in the truth; therefore, entertain the brethren." "Be hospitable to strangers." "Do good to all men."

The religious sects call this *an age of enterprize*, and their schemes *schemes of benevolence.* Have Christians no enterprize? Have we no schemes of benevolence? Is not the conversion of the world the most magnificent enterprize? And is not the whole religion of Jesus a religion of benevolence? But because Catholics and Protestants may have misapplied all these portions of scripture—because they may have abused these principles of action, must we neither rationally apply the former, nor use the latter? Shall we fold our arms as though we had nothing to do—as though we had nothing to give—as if we had only to stand still and see the salvation of God?

EDITOR.

Progress of Reform.

EXTRACT FROM LETTERS.

LONDON, *England*, November 12, 1833.

Dear brother Campbell—I THINK I cannot occupy a little leisure better than in addressing you; and I flatter myself that a few lines on certain subjects will be no less acceptable to you, than I am certain the same from you would be to me or the rest of my brethren here.

I have been here but a short time, perhaps six weeks, having been on the continent almost ever since I had the pleasure of seeing you; but as I met with no brethren there, and as the nature of my residence was purely professional, we shall pass over that part of our narrative. As you are in the habit of publishing accounts of the state and progress of the Restoration, perhaps it would be agreeable to know something respecting it abroad. The churches and brethren here, though retaining the order of a Christian church, and adhering to the ancient order of things, do not increase in members, but rather appear to be at a stand—neither decreasing nor increasing much, but remaining in pretty nearly the same condition in number as they were about the time of Father M'Clean. In fact, it could not well be otherwise, since some mistaken notions respecting Evangelists, and the duty of supporting them, have prevailed to an unhappy extent; but at this precise time there appears to be a general awaking on this subject, and the churches are now considering what is enjoined, and taking means to do their duty.

The number of our churches here, as near as I can ascertain is twenty-six, or thirty: from twenty members up to about three hundred each, or thereabouts. Most of the efficient men, such as the contemporaries of M'Clean, Inglis, Broadwood, Moncrief, &c. have gone to their reward; but there are still a few left. The church with which I am united numbers about thirty. We have two elders, both Jones* and Nixon, able ministers indeed. We live in great peace, imitate closely the churches in Judea, attend to exhortation, the apostles' doctrine, &c. every Lord's day. But the brethren here were perfectly astonished at my statement of the progress of the Restoration in the United States. They were, indeed, overjoyed to learn that there are so many congregations whose sole guide is the New Testament—whose only model is that of the first churches in Judea, and who regard a return to first principles as the only desirable reform.

P. C. WYETH.

GRAND GULF, Mi. February 16, 1834.

IT has been about fourteen months since I left the territory of Babylon, and marched into the liberty of the gospel kingdom. At that time I fully understood (as I humbly conceive) the two points of difficulty, which suggested themselves to my mind, viz.—the operations of the Holy Spirit and immersion for remission, as taught in the Scriptures. Since then I have abandoned those human devices which I observed before; such as the mourner's bench or seat, and escorting sinners to such and pray God to forgive them, instead of directing them to obey the Living Oracles; indeed, I thought there was no such thing as getting along without it. But I determined to lay aside every thing, and read the word of God as though I had never read it before, and to believe it to be God's voice through the word—then it was I leaped out of darkness into that light and liberty which cannot be expressed. Since then I see the great difference in urging God's word only, and my former course where I mingled the devices of men with the good news. And in all I have acted honestly, and I have no doubt that there are many in the same unhappy situation. Formerly I had my fears and hopes, and did not know

**The Author of the Biblical Encyclopedia and the History of the Christian Church.*

whether I was right or wrong; but now I go forth trusting in God's word, and I know just as certain as my Saviour reigns, that truth is mighty and will prevail. I have seen lately the power of truth; for eighteen days in succession the word only was proclaimed; and such was its power, through God, that twenty-five were made the subjects of Christ's reign and introduced into the kingdom, and those were from the world & two of the popular sects of the West. The same hour of the night they believed, obeyed, and rejoiced in the liberty and freedom of the gospel. Bless the Lord, O my soul! thou hast seen the power of God's word in all of its original character!

My brother, I care but little about the smiles of this world, and I am determined, as much as in me lies, to wield the sword of the Spirit. You inform me that the field is white for the harvest eastward, and so it is far south. Let us take courage and go on. Ere long the kingdoms of this world and the sects will assuredly become the kingdom of our Lord and his Christ.

J. R. M.

NEW LISBON, Ohio, March 25, 1834.

Beloved Brother—I HAVE but little news to send you; for we progress but slowly in New Lisbon. However, I do rejoice that some of the brethren are increasing in knowledge and obedience. Six weeks ago last first day, the Rev. Mr. Shaffer, of the Lutheran church, met with us. When we had adjourned I was introduced to him. He said that he had come to see our order in worship. As you have enjoyed the opportunity, (I said in return,) what have you to say? He replied, "It is the first time that I ever beheld a band of brothers and sisters worship as the Scriptures read to me, and it is the most lovely sight I ever beheld." To be brief, he met brother Jones Hartzel at brother Philip's meeting house last Saturday, on his way to New Lisbon, and was immersed with his wife, for remission, and came on with brother Hartzel to New Lisbon; and towards the close of worship he arose and gave his reasons for renouncing the *Lutheran Gospel*, as he called it, in a masterly manner.———Last first day week a Mr. Mackey, a Methodist class-leader, a man of unsullied character, came forward and was immersed for remission, and rejoices with us. Praised be the Lord!

JOAB GASKILL.

POMPEY, N. Y. March 18, 1834.

REFORM is rapidly increasing in this state. I have not now time to state the particulars. Since my last there have been one hundred immersed, as many Baptists converted, and one preacher.

J. J. MOSS.

BALTIMORE, Md. March 15, 1834.

I HAVE returned a day or two ago from Beaver Creek, where you preached, near Hagerstown. I preached twice there on last Lord's day to a crowded house, and immersed three on the good confession. The next day (Monday) I spoke at 11 o'clock, near Boonsborough, when three more were immersed for remission. [I immersed one of Mr. Witmore's sons, on Beaver creek.] I then spoke on Monday evening, near Williamsport. There are three bodies of the disciples who meet in each of the above places, numbering in all from one hundred and twenty to one hundred and forty.

JAMES HENSHALL.

LEBANON MILLS, Warren County, Ten. January 22, 1834.

Dear Brother—I HAVE anticipated the idea some time since of sending you a few lines, hoping that it may perchance be beneficial to some friend or relation and to the good cause of reformation. I lived ten years an acceptable member with the Methodists, and during that time neither preacher nor steward ever had to call me in question. This is the truth, and they cannot

deny it. I then began to read my book for myself, and soon became convinced that I never had been baptized, as the New Testament held forth immersion to me as the only valid baptism. I then went to hear my now much beloved brother A. Anderson preach, and was so well satisfied that I was willing to lay aside my *decency*, or, in in other words, *sprinkling*, and was immersed by brother Anderson; for which I incurred the displeasure of the most of my relations; but, thanks be to the Lord, since that time I have enjoyed great peace of mind from a knowing sense of having done the will of the Lord. Our Paidobaptist friends say we make too much of the *water*. Be that as it may, I can assure them that I have felt more peace and comfort in six months since than in ten years before I was immersed, as I am now able to rejoice in all things, giving glory to God for opening my eyes and enabling me to do his will, obey his commands, practise the precepts, and thus go on doing the will of the Lord from day to day, until he thinks proper to call me home to rest. At the same time it would give me great satisfaction to see and hear of some others trying the experiment. Say there is no virtue in the water. Well, I say, if there is none in the water, there is some in *obeying the Lord;* and it is his will for us to go under the water, or else he would never have put any under himself, and this gives virtue to the water; for in going under the water we are doing his will; and doing his will, we are sure of his blessing here and a crown of glory hereafter. May the prejudice of all parties be overcome by love, and may they obey the commands and practise the precepts, that they may be found in Jesus, like the manslayer in the city of refuge! SARAH HIGGERSON SPIER.

☞ *We have to lay over much of the progress of reform till next month.*—Ed.

PROPOSALS

By John Thomas, M. D. of Philadelphia, for publishing by Subscription, a Monthly Periodical, to be titled THE APOSTOLIC ADVOCATE.

"WE (the Apostles) are of God: he who knows God, hearkens to us; he who knows not God, hearkens not to us. By this we know the Spirit of Truth, and the Spirit of Error."—1 John iv. 6. *Macknight's Translation.*

"Be mindful of the words before spoken by the Holy Prophets, and of the Commandment of us, the Apostles of the Lord and Saviour."—2 Pet. iii. 2.—*Macknight.*

THIS work shall be devoted to the Ancient Gospel and the Original Constitution of Things as proclaimed and appointed by the Apostles. Never was there a time since the days of William Penn, that this and adjacent cities required such an "Advocate" as at this present. The voice of the Apostles is stifled by the clamor of sectarian declamation. It is true, indeed, they are talked about, and their statues adorn cathedral parapets and steepled walls—it is also true, that the commercial marts of Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and New York abound in religious establishments, each and every of them amply furnished with all the gorgeousness and splendid trappings of Temple Worship:—they can boast, too, of an erudite, courtly, eloquent and right reverend priesthood—the depositories of wisdom and sacred knowledge—whose fertile ingenuity illustrates, sustains, and fulminates the Dogmas of Creeds for the deglutition of an unsuspecting and too-confiding Laity. But all these things, however adored, may be easily unmasked, and resolved in their ultimate constituents—the devices, traditions, commandments of men; and will be proved to be no part of the RELIGION OF CHRIST, or of the Traditions and Teachings of the HOLY APOSTLES. THE ADVOCATE,

therefore, will unrol his brief against these corruptions of Christianity; and, while he pays all respect to persons that is due, he will use every honorable and scriptural means to disabuse the minds of his fellow citizens of the philosophical Dogmas and christianized Orientalism palmed upon them for the Glorious Gospel of the Blessed God.

In subserviency to this end, the following, among other subjects, will be attended to:—

1. The Non-Identity of all Popular Religion with the Religion of Christ.

2. The defence of the Holy Scriptures against all creeds, 'Confessions of Faith,' Commentators and System Makers.

3. The *objects* proposed by the proselyting Spirit of the Age as developed in the so styled "*benevolent institutions of the day*," incompatible with, and contrary to the predictions of the Ancient Prophets.

4. The modern *dogmas* of physical and spiritual operations, *not* the *doctrines* of the Holy Spirit taught by the Apostles.

5. The Fates and Fortunes of the Kingdoms of the World foreshown by prophecy.

6. Religious, Moral, and Literary varieties; with Essays on various interesting and important subjects in relation to the Kingdom of Christ.

"The Advocate" will glean from the fields of Christian Literature whatever is calculated to illustrate the magnificent and sublime politics of Messiah's Reign. He will endeavor to do justly to all who may oppose and differ from him; his object being to convince, not to condemn. *Audi alteram partem*, hear the other side,—shall always vibrate in his ear;—for, having neither sympathies nor antipathies to gratify—having no gift or "sacred office" of pecuniary emolument to blind his eyes, to pervert his judgment, or to distort his mental vision—being interested in upholding no religious dogmas, in sustaining no sect, in pleading for no sectarian creed—The Advocate will strive to exemplify the apothem—*fiat justitia ruat cœlum*, let justice be done though the heavens fall.—Let the opponents of the Ancient Gospel go and do likewise.

CONDITIONS.

1. Each number to be published the beginning of every month and to contain 24 pages doudecimo.

2. The subscription will be One Dollar a year *exclusive of postage*, payable in advance, on receiving the first number. If not paid within *three months* One Dollar and Fifty Cents; and no subscriptions for a less period than aforesaid.

4. Postmasters, who act as agents, shall have ten per cent for obtaining subscribers, and for collecting and remitting the amount of their subscriptions. All other persons, who obtain and pay for five subscribers within three months from subscribing, shall have one copy gratis. But to those who do not guaranty and pay within that period, ten per cent upon all subscribers, for whom they make payment shall be allowed.

5. *All Communications to the Advocate must be directed to the Editor, 130 Arch Street, opposite the Theatre, Philadelphia; and also* POST PAID *or they will be returned.*

P. S. It is respectfully submitted, that all desirous of the downfall of the Apostacy; and interrested in the re-establishment of the Ancient Gospel, and Restoration of the Apostolic Order of Things over the Ruins of the Man of Sin in all his subtle and specious forms in these Eastern Cities, will exert their influence in sustaining the endeavors of the Editor to that end.

N. B. Let all persons be careful to name the post office to which they wish their papers sent.

To be published at T. Brindley's, 63 Chesnut Street.

BROTHER Thomas is already known to many of our readers from his able review of the Catholic controversy, and to myself he is so well known as a talented, devoted, and zealous disciple of the Messiah—as an honorable and independent advocate of the truth, who has, through his veneration and affection for the apostolic institution, sacrificed his temporal and professional interests and honors, that I cannot but announce with pleasure his project as above developed. This pleasure is heightened from the consideration, that the city of Philadelphia is to be the theatre of his editorial labors, and the eastern cities the special object of his attention. My late visit to these cities has confirmed the representations that were made to me of their deplorable situation as regards religious instructions. Because of the literary, political, and commercial eminence and standing of these great marts of American commerce, many associate with this pre-eminence an idea of their superior opportunities and attainments in religious knowledge. But this is a fatal error. From more than twenty years intimate acquaintance with the religious world, East and West, I have not a doubt that the western country generally, deficient as it is, is greatly in advance, of not only the sea board, but of the Atlantic cities, in the heavenly science and practice of the Christian institution, and in general religious information and instruction. I say this is a *fatal* error—fatal for the country that looks up to these cities for that eminence in the knowledge of God which they possess in the knowledge of Mammon; and fatal to the citizens themselves, because of their imaginary religious advantages, and their consequent disdain for the attainments of others. An aristocracy of wealth, of learning, of talent, there may be, but an aristocracy of religious information, and of the knowledge of revelation, there is not—there cannot be. I mean no inviduous distinctions, nor generic classifications of one part of our population against another. They are all needy enough, but the greatest need for evangelical, or what some call missionary labors, appear to exist in the eastern cities.

This new periodical furnishes another occasion for the liberality of the brethren. Those who need these aids least, are called upon to contribute most, for the sake of others. Just as we value the benefits we have received from the increase of Christian knowledge and

enjoyment from the labors of others, will we contribute to the diffusion of the same blessings to our destitute neighbors. It is owing to the press that light has been so generally diffused among the people; and that the reformation has spread so far and wide in so short a time. The last *ten* years furnish facts and documents on this subject better than theory or analogical reasonings. The tongue, as far as it can be heard, is first and chief of all the moral instruments bestowed on man; but the *pen*, because of the permanancy and greater indelibility of its operations, commands a wider and a more lasting influence, while the press gives to it wings and strength, which, as yet, transcend all our calculations.

This is our palladium against the incursions and attacks of the rulers of the darkness of this world—this the chariot of that moral war for truth and virtue, which, notwithstanding all adverse fates and fortunes, must ultimate gloriously and triumphantly.

The brethren and friends of reformation principles, it is hoped, will sustain this effort, until a fair trial shall have been made for the eastern cities. This new Advocate will have to succeed by the force of truth alone; for against it will be arrayed the sectarian powers that be in all the formidable artillery of defamation, misrepresentation, and of that hideous power of "censure and expulsion" which has been vouchsafed to all children of the hierarchies of the old world.

I once thought that the CHRISTIAN BAPTIST would itself have sufficed for the developement of the great principles of the restoration of the apostolic institutions, and that these once laid before the public, we might cease our operations in the editorial department. But we calculated too much upon the number and the sincerity of those who prayed earnestly that they might know and stand perfect and complete in all the revealed will of God. Alas! our experince has taught us that still "the called are many, but the choice spirits are few," and that the distortions, and inquisitions, and racks, and tortures, to which our sentiments have been submitted, call for a perpetual advocacy. Apologies for the Apostles' doctrine and defence of it are as necessary now as in the time Nero and Domitian. And if there were not a new idea to communicate, the illustration and defence of those already offered, calls for unremitting exertion on the part of all who have a tongue to plead, or a hand to wield the pen for God. Much of the volume called the New Testament was occasioned by opposition to the gospel, and had the Apostles lived longer they would have found it as necessary to write as to speak against error and errorists.

Moreover, there are communities and large districts of country which the doctrine of the ancient institutions has not yet reached. To such the republication and defence of the principles of reformation are as necessary as they formerly were to those who now best understand them. The labors of the press, then, must not only continue, but increase as the emergencies require. All that is necessary to the triumph of the cause we plead is a candid and fair hearing. Wherever this has been obtained it has always triumphed. This our

opponents now fully understand. Their experience teaches them, however slow to learn other things, that they can only retain their dominion by keeping "the bad leaven" at a distance, and by "censure and expulsion" of all the affected members. The positive prohibition of reading our writings, now so fashionable among the orthodox, is positive and undeniable proof of the estimate in which they are held by the wisest of our opponents. May the good Lord speed and prosper the labors of the press and the tongues that plead his cause, that Christians may be emancipated, and that sinners may be saved from the impending vengeance!

Editor Mill. Harbinger.

CURE FOR HYDROPHOBIA.

DR. BUISSON is said to have discovered an infallible remedy for *hydrophobia*, which he has communicated to the Academie des Sciences, in Paris. He had no expectation of recovery, and went into a vapor bath, heated to 42 degrees Reaumur, (126 Fahrenheit,) as the easiest mode of suffocation. To his astonishment the whole symptoms vanished at once, and he has never since had the slightest recurrence of this dreadful disease. By the same means he has cured upwards of eighty patients, and he intends to try its efficacy in cases of cholera, plague, yellow fever, and gout.

New York paper.

BROTHER Daniel Olds, of Madison county, Alabama, and the disciples around him, should, in my judgment, meet every Lord's day to keep the ordinances of the Saviour.

Let me answer a hundred letters in one sentence. One hundred queries contained in one —"When are you coming to visit us? There is no place in America so much needs your labors as this place. It is a very important crisis here just now. A great deal might be done now, just now—that cannot be expected at another time," &c. &c. More than one hundred queries of this import have been received here within a few months. If we had the wings of an eagle, and the strength of Samson, we could not answer these queries. Suffice it to say, we do all we can in travelling, writing, and speaking. We cannot do more than we have been for several years doing. It is not possible to stretch beyond what we have done, and are doing. It would afford us as much delight to see our brethren as to be seen and heard by them. We must go first where we think it most useful—not where we would like best to go, or where our brethren would like most to see us. This is our rule of operation. We sometimes prefer to go where no one wishes to see us, and where we can promise little at present, but in hope of future fruit.

EDITOR.

☞MANY Queries proposed for solution, are laid over to next month.

☞"A REFORMER," a communication from J. BUCHANAN, Esq. British Consul, New York; also, the Decree of Pope Lucius III. in our next.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Number V.——Volume V.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Bethany, Va. May, 1834.

Signs of the Times.

[CONCLUDED.]

ALL judge by their creeds and their conscience, and all infallibly right—all specially called and sent by the Holy Spirit to promulge one hundred or more different gospels; aye, and taught by the Spirit too! All put up equal claims of being *called* and *taught* by one Spirit to teach diversities, divisions, and strife! Are these differing votaries of these differing gospels all ambassadors? They have a different embassy. Nor can they read the letters patent from the great King; but call certain parts "*a sealed book.*" Now would God, in infinite wisdom and goodness, send his dependant creatures an unintelligible message, and call it revelation! or specially call and send a messenger who could not read his message; nor give any special token of his mission! But they have an internal call: so have thousands of the laity who never put on holy orders. Those impulses and feelings are by no means peculiar to the clergy or the orthodoxy: the Shakers were famous for impulse-teaching and absurdities of conduct. When we depart from the teaching of the Bible, we may run without rudder or compass into a thousand errors and endless confusion. But can our teachers be relied on? They are teaching different ways. Are they overseers? They have ruled with a rod of iron. Are they servants? They have made laws for the Master's house. Are they watchmen? They are sleeping, and the Master is about to come on them unawares. Are they shepherds? They have scattered and divided the flock. Are they ambassadors? They come with a different embassy. Are they building a spiritual house unto God? In it there is a confusion of tongues. "They build Zion with blood, and Jerusalem with iniquity. The heads thereof judge for reward, and the priests thereof teach for hire, and the prophets thereof divine for money: yet will they lean upon the Lord, and say, Is not the Lord among us? None evil can come upon us."

If this was applicable to the heads and teachers in the typical dispensation, it must be much more so to the typifyed. The portrait of the Christian world, taken as a whole, cannot be drawn in fewer words: I mean the portrait of our teachers and those who have the management of God's moral administration in their hands: on them is justly chargeable all the error and divisions in the Christian world, and all the martyrdoms too. They are too wise to learn from common sense—too infallibly right to doubt—too happy to investigate. To study the prophecies might break their repose. They know enough of the sacred oracles, if rightly practised, to secure them a seat in the kingdom of God. The meaning of prophecy will be known in the accomplishment. The Apocalypse is a sealed book; God, by his Spirit, will reveal its meaning when necessary: a Millennium will come in God's own time and way without our concern. "Is not the Lord among us? None evil can come upon us."

We will now briefly examine a Millennium on the plan of the orthodoxy. Suppose a mighty outpouring of the Spirit, the heathen world evangelized, the knowledge of the Lord covering the earth as the waters do the sea. Suppose war ceases, and there be nothing to hurt or offend. Suppose the present population of the world to be eight hundred millions. This population, with nothing to "hurt or offend," with "health, peace, and competence," will double more than once in every thirty years—doubling thus for a thousand years, amounts to a prodigy. It goes far beyond my powers of calculation. I just suppose the whole face of the globe would be literally covered with human beings.* Every tillable foot of land on earth, under the highest cultivation, could not sustain one-tenth part of its inhabitants. From this an argument may be drawn which cannot be overthrown—that there is to be a tremendous destruction of the human family previous to the introduction of the Millennium, or there is to be no such a time. It also proves that the great human drama is soon to be wound up of necessity. If the world be not rid of its inhabitants by pestilence and war, universal famine in all its horrors is to succeed, or an interminable state of warfare of man against man for his existence. In less than five hundred years, with the present population, their Millennium will eventuate in a scene of calamity without its parallel in the history of man. Their Millennium will inevitably destroy itself, without a previous destruction of the human family. A sad alternative is unavoidably before mankind. Some minister of destruction is to thin the world of its inhabitants, or the slow and sure approach of interminable famine unavoidable, instead of the long-looked-for, long-foretold Millennium. This will be looked at as visionary by those who believe that which suits them, without the trouble of calculation.

*Say that population will double itself every thirty years—give mankind room, health, peace, and competence—which must be granted, or there is no Millennium; and from every pair now on earth will spring a progeny far outnumbering the present population of the whole world, in a thousand years. Double every 33 years, and you will make more than double the amount of the supposed number of inhabitants on earth—from a single pair!

The eastern world is now groaning under its weight of population; thousands of homeless beings living on the cold hand of charity. With us, the mighty tide of emigration ceaselessly rolling to the West, in less than two centuries will be bounded by the Western Ocean. Population is to receive a tremendous check, or the Millennium is not to be consummated in the glory and happiness that inspiration has induced us to expect

The Millennium, with some of the orthodox, is to come about by bringing the arts and sciences to perfection: man is to live long, enjoying all the bounties of nature, and die of old age.

I suppose speculation and avarice are to be satiated with wealth; priests and kings, with power; folly and vanity are to chasten themselves into sobriety; intoxication, by charm, quit its revels; rage, revenge, malice, lust, those untameable passions of men, are to cease their lawless dominion over our race, no more impel to deeds of desperation, and, by some unaccountable change, to be physically converted into the humility and meekness of the lowly Saviour. Turks or Jews, long famous for their hostility against the Christian religion, are to be brought into the faith, contrary to their faith or inclination. These things are to be done by supernatural power; for under man's best exertions, the world is growing worse.

The opinions of the orthodox are about as correct on millennial matters as they are on their systems of divinity. Their gigantic efforts to evangelize the world at the present, is tending to perfect the analogy between the present and the past dispensations: compassing sea and land to make proselytes; and when made, they are two fold more the children of hell.

In my way I have shown that dispensations have closed—therefore, may close again; that they never have lasted longer than about two thousand years; that none have been renovated after becoming corrupt, but always dissolved; that judgments have always followed the abuse of mercy; that the present dispensation has become corrupt, and is drawing to a close; that sore and heavy judgments are to to follow in close succession, pestilence and tremendous bloodshed; that the present dispensation is the antitype of the Jewish, and that the faults and fate of the one is, and will be, the faults and fate of the other; that the fall of antichrist, and the coming of the Son of Man are to be contemporaneous events; that prophecy, without the most palpable absurdities and contradictions, will not concentrate on the close of time, and that the dissolution of nature is unscriptural and unreasonable; that Christ is to come in the clouds of heaven a thousand years before the end, and that nothing but Christ's second coming can convert the Jews and the heathen world; that no given amount of filthy lucre can evangelize the human family; that false teaching has ruined the Christian world; that we are to have a new dispensation—an "everlasting gospel;" and lastly, have shown that the Millennium cannot be sustained at all upon the commonly received opinions; and may the Lord forgive me if I have wronged the clergy! If the doctrine of Christ's second coming be true, I have

not censured them too much—if it be not true, I have. If the doctrine be unreasonable or unscriptural, then did one of the greatest philosophers the world ever produced believe an unreasonable and unscriptural doctrine, (Newton.) If it be a scriptural doctrine, and prove true on their hands, how can they stand acquitted when called to account by the Master for their *unbelief*?

But a word to those who are pleading for reformation:—A time of trouble is certainly approaching the world; it is foretold, and the signs appear—pestilence and war are standing in dread array against the human family. A heavy stroke is hanging over devoted Europe.* Where the government that is to stand amidst the mighty wreck? The best may first fall. We should know, and prepare for "a time of trouble such as never was." Distress and perplexity of nations is to precede a time of redemption; and a divine consolation in the midst of war and rumor, that the wise shall understand. Now how is this knowledge to be obtained? By infusion, like the grace of some? Or is it to be gained by diligently searching the Scriptures of truth? Some may say that God in his own time will reveal these things by his Spirit. If the meaning of prophecy can be had from the Prophets, can we expect the Spirit to produce in us the knowledge by supernatural means—a knowledge which can be had by industry, with the means already in our hands? A first revelation is useless, if a second must be made to *reveal* its meaning! God rewards the diligent; and he who searches the word for information, will unquestionably be the very individual to whom the second revelation will be made. None other than the Bible student can expect the reward of the wise. Knowledge must be prior to obedience; and to know God's will and obey it, is just the knowledge alluded to by Daniel. To be wise and to understand, is a matter of no small consideration. For "the wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament." It is far safer to err by a scrupulous and literal obedience to the gospel, by performing the commands of the Master in a way that will fairly prevent mistakes, rather than draw inferences and perform a supposed obedience; for there cannot be two ways of obeying one solitary command of the Master. But there are many ways in practice of obeying a certain command which I could name—many ways of getting round, or obeying every command or precept in the gospel.

But to return. The storm which seems to be gathering on the political horizon of all nations, cannot pass over and leave them unhurt. The thrones are to be cast down, civil and ecclesiastic; and connected with this is the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven. Can a good man dread the coming of his Lord and Master? No, if he be obeying his will, what has he to fear? Piety has nothing

*As some of our politicians are beginning to prophesy the invasion of Europe from the North, if they will examine Daniel the Prophet on the subject, they may find something to strengthen their faith. I can make no other application of the prophecy: "And at the time of the end shall the King of the South push at him; and the King of the North shall come against him like a whirlwind, with chariots and with horsemen," &c. The King of the South (Napoleon) did make a push at His Holiness.

to fear. Human nature has since his resurrection stood in his presence; and he who expects it, may again. I boast no uncommon courage. Timid women once saw him without being petrified. I know not how a good man can treat the subject of Christ's second coming with contempt, or even neglect. No argument more powerful in pleading the cause of reformation. The man who believes it is almost persuaded to be a Christian. We cannot heartily believe the doctrine, and eagerly pursue the world, its gains, pleasures, or amusements. No one can be a rigid sectarian and believe the dissolution of the present dispensation to be at hand. A stickler for creeds, disciplines, &c. will be as sceptical on the subject as a rank Deist.

While the present dispensation lasts, it is in full force, and no time to be lost. Heaven's high authority is pledged to reward those who turn many to righteousness. "And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars forever and ever." The end is hastening, the night is far spent, the day is at hand; a scene is soon to be ushered in which will eclipse all earthly glory—all that has ever been witnessed on earth; when kingdoms and empires will tumble into ruin; thrones and dominions "swept with the besom of destruction;" when the armies of heaven, in grand procession, will escort the King of kings to our world. Celestial foreigners, imperial guests, strange visitants! What kind of reception are they to have?

The King, after an absence of eighteen hundred years, finds his household in confusion—the world drenched in blood—the servants drunken with the wine of Babylon, (a spirit of domination,) dividing and scattering the misguided flock—the kings of the earth, "imperial butchers" of mankind, maddened with a rage for plunder and power, slaying their thousands—the world a great slaughter house—the art of murder and shedding human blood taught as a science—the greatest proficients in the horrid trade deified—discord, persecution, and war desolating the world—mankind in the general violating every command of his Creator. When the trumpet sounds the mighty onset, alas! how few will have on the wedding garment, and will be ready to enter in to the marriage supper!

But a persecuted faithful few will be found, uninfluenced by the world's applause, and as regardless of its censures, standing up for a literal unqualified obedience to the sacred oracles, pleading its high authority, bending the will, the judgment, the faith to its imperial demands. If there be a possibility of erring in literally obeying God's word, taking it for the only rule of faith and practice, such errors will surely be the most pardonable in the eyes of the Judge. I had much rather be found warring against creeds, confessions, books of discipline, commandments of men, &c. than to be found warring for them. A zeal for the high authority, the honor due God's word cannot well be blameworthy in his presence; while a zeal for the commandments of men cannot fail to meet a just condemnation from him. A faithful servant cannot dread his Master's presence; nor a cordial, strict follower of his word and example, hear the dread-

ful "Depart from me, I know you not." The plaudit of the Master, "Well done, good and faithful servant!" will compensate for all the reproach suffered for his name's sake.

Carefully and candidly examine this important subject; make it familiar, lest it come on you as "a thief in the night." Let your thoughts, taught by the sacred book, restrained and chastened within the lines of possibility, realize the subject, anticipate the event, the destined period marked by the mind of Omnipotence—when the imperial army, all clad in the ensigns of royalty, all numbered, all arranged in heavenly order; all in ranks, not a delinquent, not a dissonant voice; all in uniform, in heaven's attire, clothed in light, one spirit, one glow of animation, one Lord, one conquering King of kings—a signal for the march sounded, the host on wing, "ten thousand times ten thousand," with the speed of lightning arriving within our horizon, pouring a flood of light, a tide of brilliant cherubic millions on the astonished vision of man—"a great noise of a trumpet." Thousands die at the sight—others hail the scene. Empires and kingdoms, thrones and dominions sink into non-existence. Crowns, sceptres, diadems, mingle with the dust. The strife of war, the din of arms, the clangor of martial array, the shout of victory, the tumult of battle will be hushed in perpetual silence, never, never to be again heard, or changed into the emphatic "wail because of him"—human glory and grandeur prostrate in a moment—the glittering garniture, the gorgeous trappings, the gilded equipage of sceptred divinity, their will-worship appendages, their human standards consigned to eternal oblivion—the hierarchies of the church and their deluded followers calling on the "mountains and rocks" to hide them. Amidst the mighty wreck of human glory some will remain unhurt and lift up their heads in the day of their redemption. They were waiting the return of the Master; and to them that look for him will he come the second time without sin unto salvation. "Amen! even so; come, Lord Jesus."

Essays on the Style of the Living Oracles,

And Critical Dissertations on the Meaning of Difficult Phrases; with an Examination of the Allusions found in the Christian Books to Ancient Institutions, Manners, and Customs.

No. 1.

THE pleadings for the original gospel and order of things, by those engaged in the present proposed reformation and return to first principles, is likely to produce a new era in the mode of reading, interpreting, and applying the sacred writings of the Apostles and Evangelists of Jesus Christ. Already a perceptible change has occurred beyond the precincts of our communion. Not only do the advocates of reformation, but even many of its ostensible opposers, reform in the whole system of interpreting, expounding, and quoting sacred Scripture. All persons of discernment, acquainted with the history of the

last ten years, and whose recollection of the times antecedent are at all vivid, see and feel this, and the candid on all sides acknowledge it. The written documents of the last twenty years furnish monumental proof of this fact, and we feel every assurance that ten years to come will put it out of the power of the most truth-daring opposers to deny it. The developments of this series of essays, imperfect as it may be, and must be, under all the circumstances, may thereafter be appealed to as proof of a change in the diction of many of the preachers and teachers of religion. Our reasons for such an avowal the sequel may disclose.

The terms *faith*, *repentance*, *reformation*, *baptism*, *regeneration—the Holy Spirit*, *gift of the Holy Spirit—spiritual gift*, *law*, *gospel*, *covenant*, *institution*, *justification*, *sanctification*. *adoption*, &c. &c. have been set in a new light before the public mind, and the most reluctant to see and acknowledge it are unable to sustain themselves in the denial. But much is yet to be done to sustain what has been achieved, and to effect a still more sensible change in the whole religious vocabulary.

The last century, with a few exceptions, was occupied in the warfare of opinions—in the conflicts of Calvinism and Arminianism—of Trinitarianism and Unitarianism—of the divine right of Episcopacy, Presbytery, and Congregationalism.

A few men truly learned in sacred literature, (and the number of such is yearly diminishing,) did exert their influence to oppose the tide of fanaticism, rationalism, enthusiasm, and superstition, which seemed to deluge christendom with the jargon of a religious Aristotelianism; but they lacked that reputation for *spiritualism* indispensable to sanctify their labors and to canonize their works in the schools of "spiritual theology." Those who spoke of common sense and of the necessity of attending to the established rules of interpretation—to the *literal* import of words and phrases, were suspected as destitute of the teachings of the Holy Spirit—mere natural men, unregenerate, unsound at the heart—at least of doubtful reputation. To this class belonged such men as Whitby, Grotius, Locke, Hammond, Taylor, Pearce, Benson, Campbell, Macknight, Michaelis, Vitringa, Ernesti, Harwood, the Newtons, Warburton, Daubuz, &c. &c. &c. I do not say that any of these carried out to perfection the principles which he laid down or recognized; but they all, as far as they went, and as far as their attention was called to matters of criticism, did obeisance to the only rational system of reading and interpreting the sacred records.

In proportion as mysticism and new revelations obtain credit in any community, the true knowledge of christianity must decrease. Men who depend upon immediate suggestions, and divine communications upon what is already written, can arrive at certain knowledge without the pains of reading, reflection, and careful examination. The expectation of such supernatural assistance fosters that natural indolence, and aversion to close application, characteristic of the great majority of our degraded race. We are very far from think-

ing that Christians are not constantly to look up to the Father of Lights for the teachings of his good spirit, that they may have just and adequate views of his communications by the Prophets and Apostles; but this in aid of their inquiries, and not to supersede the necessity of constant reading, thinking, and examination of what is written. When we look up to heaven for any of the bounties of the providence of God, it is not to be fed or preserved by miracle, but by the use of all commanded means. Neither do we expect a single ray of new light above or beyond what is revealed, when we prayerfully set about the study of the Bible.

But it is quite another sort of spirit we have in view when we speak of those sudden illuminations and spiritual discoveries which furnish the subject with all knowledge, and instantaneously fit him for the work of interpretation. We have met not a few who even ridicule the use of learning and despise all rules of interpretation, and pride themselves on their supernatural attainments and extraordinary qualifications to interpret the Scriptures because they are taught of God; and who would seem to cast an eye of pity on those who are less favored than themselves, and who endeavor to search the Scriptures as they do other writings to find out the ideas communicated by the Spirit of God. These, like an ancient Prophet, let go the handles of the plough, and forthwith become men of God and trust-worthy guides of the public mind in all questions concerning the knowledge of the will of God.

But to proceed to our object. We would observe that as God has spoken in our language and ordered his communications to be written and addressed to our understandings, our understandings must be exercised upon his communications as they are upon all written communications, and no divine aid is to be expected that will supersede the necessity of the same minute attention to all rules of grammar, and of composition, and of interpretation, which are necessary to understand any other intelligible communication addressed to our reason: and for this reason all the writers of the New Testament conformed to the same rules of grammar, logic, and rhetoric according to which the Greek and Roman writers of their day modelled their compositions. Without a proper regard to these, no person can understand any thing he reads or hears, human or divine.

This being conceded, we have next to observe that the eight authors of the Living Oracles had each his own peculiar idiom, and mode of thinking, reasoning, and expressing himself on the subject of Christianity, as upon any other subject. Therefore, while the ideas were suggested by the Holy Spirit, the inspired person was left to the choice of words and to his own mode of expressing himself; and therefore we find each of them distinguished by idiomatic or peculiar modes of expression, as much as by his own name. Though we must regard these writers as using their own modes of speech, and as selecting their own words, both in speaking and writing; yet so plenary was their inspiration that they could not select an improper term or a word not in accordance with the mind of the Spirit. That

they did select different words to express the same ideas cannot be disputed: for the person whom one calls a *lunatic*, another calls a *demoniac;* and each writer gives his own version of almost every thing he narrates.

Nothing is more necessary to an accurate knowledge of the inspired books, than a very special attention to the minutiæ of style to every thing however small or apparently trivial; for in truth there is meaning in every thing which fell from the tongues and pens of their heaven-taught authors. All the improvements in natural science, of which this age boasts, have resulted from a strict attention to all the minutiæ of nature. Chemistry, botany, mineralogy, and, indeed, all the exact sciences, have emerged from their early and rude condition to their present splendor and dignity, by the most minute attention to the very smallest matters. It is the knowledge of the parts, the smallest parts of any thing, which constitutes the knowledge of the whole. The same observation applies with equal certainty, and to the same extent, in the acquisition of a correct and certain knowledge of the Living Oracles. The *writers* must be studied as well as the *writings*. The time, place, circumstances, manners, customs of the addressed must be accurately examined, with the utmost care, by every one who would become a scribe well instructed in the affairs of the kingdom of heaven. Though these studies are not necessary to a saving knowledge of the gospel, they are to exact and comprehensive views and conceptions of the revelations of God. And were a proper course of reading and examining the records instituted in congregations, and in the families of Christians, all the disciples would soon have a more perfect understanding of the sacred books, than the present graduates from the most renowned theological schools.

These things premised, we proceed to the examination of a phrase which is attended with much difficulty, and which is of frequent occurrence in the historical books, but which is passed over by the superficial without an inquiry. It is this:—

"*That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Prophet.*"

This phrase occurs some eight or ten times in Matthew, and as often in John. On several occasions the quotation appears to be wholly irrelevant, and sometimes the Prophet quoted cannot be found; and, indeed, generally it appears that something else than the subject of the Evangelist was in the eye of the Prophet. All these difficulties may be resolved when the current value of this single phrase is rightly appreciated. To ascertain this we shall be at some pains; and be it observed as a general rule, That almost all leading words and phrases have a strict and literal acceptation, which is their first and most obvious signification, and a secondary or accommodated meaning, which, if not altogether figurative, is a *depreciated* application of them, and must be understood in a very limited sense. To illustrate this let us take the word *prophet* itself. This term at first, in its full value, represented "an inspired messenger of God," "one who foretold future events;" yet so depreciated had this term become before the close of the New Testament, that we find it appli

ed by Paul to a *poet*, (Titus i. 12.) and according to many critics, as used in 1 Sam. x. 10. it denoted only *a singer of psalms*. This same is true of the word *prophesying:* from denoting the expressing of the oracles of God, it came to mean the interpretation and application of these oracles. 1 Cor. xiv.

Now in the same style may not the phrase "fulfilment of prophecy," mean no more than a correct application of Scripture to an event similar to that described by the Prophet? May not this, I say, be all that is imported in the depreciated and restricted sense of the phrase? This is a question which at least deserves examination.

How often are standard works quoted in this way? An orator, or a writer, often says, "This is that which some celebrated author meant"—"This is what Cicero said"—or, "As Horace says"—or, "As Bacon writes"—not meaning that Horace, or Bacon, or Cicero meant either him or his subject, or alluded to him; but that what these persons said of another person or another subject, is applicable to the person or subject of which he writes or speaks. Doubtless in this way the Jewish people and the writers of the New Testament sometimes quoted the ancient Prophets—not as meaning that they really predicted the subject of which they were treating, but importing that their words happily expressed their meaning, and illustrated and confirmed their representations. But we must closely examine a number of instances before we can speak confidently on this matter.

Let the curious and diligent student of the sacred books compare the following passages:—

Jeremiah xxxi. 15. "Thus saith the Lord, A voice was heard in Ramah, lamentation and bitter weeping; Rachel weeping for her children, refused to be comforted for her children, because they were not." Math, ii. 17. After describing the slaughter of the innocents by Herod, Matthew *quotes* this passage, saying, "*Then was fulfilled* that which was spoken by Jeremiah the Prophet, In Rama was there a voice heard," &c. &c. What was spoken by Jeremiah concerning the captivity of the ten tribes, is here said to be fulfilled in the slaughter of these babes. Is not this a *quotation* and accommodation of a similar circumstance or event, rather than a specific prediction and its accomplishment?

Again, Hosea xi. 1. "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt." Matth. ii. 15. "*That it might be fulfilled* which was spoken of the Lord by the Prophet, saying, Out of Egypt have I called my son." In Hosea the literal deliverance of Israel from Egypt is spoken of; but here the Prophet's words are *quoted* and applied to Jesus delivered from Herod by his escape to Egypt and return from it.

An instance still more striking is found in Isaiah vi. 9. "Go (Isaiah) tell this people, Hear you indeed, but understand not; and see you indeed, but perceive not. Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes, lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and be converted and healed." Jesus quotes this and applies it (Matth.

xiii. 13.) to the Jews in his time, and says in them it is fulfilled. Paul also quotes it thirty years afterwards, and applies it to the Jews in Rome, Acts xxviii. 26. This, then, can mean no more than that what was true of the Jews in the time of Isaiah, was true of them in Judea in the time of Jesus, and true of them in Rome in the time of Paul. This goes far to explain the *idiomatic* and *religious way of speaking* current among the Jews at the Christian era—from which it appears that the phrase, "*To be fulfilled*," or, "*That it might be fulfilled*," in this idiomatic style, is equivalent to *It was verified*, or, The saying of the Prophet is accomplished, or, The proverb is applicable to this event.

Such accommodations and quotations were very common among the Jews—not only with, but without the phrase, "*It was fulfilled*," or, "*That it might be fulfilled*." Paul, in Romans x. applies to the extensive diffusion of the gospel in his own time what David says of the Sun, Psalm xix. "Their line is gone out unto all the earth, and their words to the end of the world." Jer. vii. 11. "Is this house which is called by my name, become a den of robbers in your eyes? Behold even I have seen it, says the Lord." Matth. xxi. 13. Jesus says, "It is written, My house shall be called the house of prayer; but you have made it a den of thieves."

These, in Matthew's idiom, might have been called prophecies, and said to have been fulfilled in events consimilar in all the circumstances, as well as the following, (chap. xv. 7, 8.) "Hypocrites, well did Isaiah prophecy of you, saying, This people draw nigh to me with their mouth, and honor me with their lips, but their heart is far from me." Isaiah (xxix. 13.) speaks this of his contemporaries as certainly as David spoke of the Sun in Psalm xix. 1—7.

Moreover, what David (in Psalm lxxviii. 2.) says of himself is applied to Jesus, (Matth. xiii. 34, 35.) "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Prophet, I will open my mouth in parables, I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world."

Kidder, Nichols, and Sykes, in their allusions to the Talmud and the Jewish Midrashim, show that this way of speaking was common among the Jews—that in fact, this was the Jewish style of illustrating, embellishing and enforcing their moral lessons—*quoting* and applying the sacred writings in accommodation with such phrases—"Thus is fulfilled," "In this is accomplished," "What the Prophet taught, affirmed, or wrote."

There is no doubt that the word *prophet*, primarily and in its first use, did mean a literal and proper messenger from God, qualified to declare his will and foretell events yet future. Nor can there be any doubt that the term *prophesying* originally meant uttering divine oracles; and that the phrase *fulfilment of a saying or prophecy*, literally and originally meant, and still means in various places, the exact accomplishment of something foretold; we only argue that it has a secondary import, such as we have instanced; and that it is sometimes found in this secondary sense and acceptation in the narratives of the

Apostles and Evangelists; and this is to be explained upon no other principle than that propounded, viz.—that the writers of the New Testament had each his own idiom; that this idiom or peculiarity was the effect of the age and country in which he lived, and of the education which he received, and (as has been often shown) that the Holy Spirit, in employing the tongues of Prophets or the pens of Apostles to express his mind, did not change this peculiarity, but left it as he did the other peculiarities of the agents he employed.

EDITOR.

New Version Defended---No. 6.

IN prosecution of his design to detract from the value of the New Version, by impugning my aims and motives, Mr. Smith, of the *Episcopal Recorder*, in his enumeration of proofs of my alleged unsoundness in the doctrine of the Trinity, next adduces Acts xx. 28. on which he remarks as follows:—

"Acts xx. 28. To feed *the church of God*, which he has purchased with his own blood."—*Doddridge.*

"To feed *the congregation of the Lord*, which he has redeemed with his own blood.—*A. Campbell.*

"Doddridge remarks on this verse, 'How very little reason there is to follow the few copies which have [*Lord*] instead of [*God*] the Rev. Messrs. Enty and Lavington have so fully shown in their dispute with Mr. Joseph Hallet on this text, that I think this passage must be allowed as an incontestible proof, that the blood of Christ is here called the blood of God, as being the blood of that man who is God with us, God manifest in the flesh; and I cannot but apprehend that it was by the special direction of the Holy Spirit that so remarkable an expression was used.' And yet the reading of Doddridge is thrown out by Mr. Campbell without a word of comment!"

Now if in good logic and Christian candor, the substitution of *Lord* for *God* fixes suspicion upon my motives and ascertains my heresy, it will, as in the examples he has already given, indelibly fix the same reproach upon others of high celebrity. Adam Clark is a standard interpreter among the Episcopal Methodists, and has generally been considered sound in the faith by that society, and by Protestants generally. And what does this Master in Israel say? "From the collections of Wetstein and Griesbach" [great names, and sound in the faith,] "it appears that but few manuscripts, and none of them ancient, have the word *Theou, of God;* with these only the Vulgate and the latter Syriac in the text agree. *Kuriou, of the Lord*, is the reading of the A. C. D. E. several others, the Sahidic, Coptic, latter Syriac in the margin, Armenian, Æthiopic, and some of the Fathers. 'Of the Lord and of God,' is the reading of the great majority; though the *most ancient* are for Lord." Again he says, "When we grant that the greater evidence appears to be in favor of the *Lord*—'Feed the church of the Lord, which he has purchased with his own blood'—we must maintain that had not this Lord been God, his blood could have been no purchase for the souls of a lost world." So far Dr. Clark. Was he not a Unitarian, or an antiorthodox, Mr. Smith?

"This reading '*of the Lord*' is supported by the Codex Alexandrinus, Cantabrigiensis, Ephremi, and Laudeanus, all written in *uncial* letters, of great and undisputed antiquity, and derived from different and independent sources." Among the Fathers this reading is supported by Ireneus, Eusebius, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Ammonius, Maximus, Antonius, Ilas, Lucifer, Jerome, Augustine, Sedulius, Alcimus, and the author of the pretended apostolic constitutions. Were not all these heterodox and antitrinitarian!! Mr. Smith must either have known all this, or he did not. If he knew and concealed it, is he not a little knavish! If he did not know it, and wrote ignorantly, is he not a little foolish!

But with me there is one consideration, which, were the evidences only equal in favor of this reading, would decide me in favor of the New Version; and that is the phrase "*blood of God*"—a sentence which no where occurs in the sacred writings, and which expresses a sentiment incompatible with all our notions of God.

There are no less than six different readings of this verse. The New Version is, in my judgment, best supported; and in this we have the concurrence of the greatest names in christendom, ancient and modern.

We shall proceed to the next instance:—

"Philippians ii, 6. 7. Who being in the form of God *did not think it robbery to be like God.—Macknight.*

"Who being in the form of God, *thought it not robbery to be as God.* &c. *Doddridge.*

"Who though he was in the form of God, *did not affect to appear in divine majesty,* &c.—*A. Campbell.*

"Macknight and Doddridge have departed without good cause from the common version in this passage, as is satisfactorily proved by Bishop Pearson and Schleusner, but they have not gone far enough it seems, to satisfy Mr. Campbell. A literal translation, or indeed any translation at all, does not here please him, and he therefore borrows *a paraphrase* from the Unitarians.—The term, *thought it no robbery,* which both of his authorities adopt, he throws out altogether, and neither the literal rendering *equal to God,* nor the modification *as God,* nor even *like God,* will suit his views. No intimation is given of a departure here from Macknight and Doddridge."

"Without a comment"—"No intimation is given." What does this mean? Did the gentleman think we were going to write ten volumes of notes and comments, because Messrs. Campbell and Macknight had written ten? This is a mere *ad captandum*—a stroke of policy—an unmanly inuendo. He says we *borrowed* this from the Unitarians. This is not true! I know of no Unitarian who thus paraphrases it. Ought not a Clergyman to be cautious of affirming without proof, or of asserting a fact for which he can produce no testimony? Or must he hazard his veracity, and assert at a venture to carry a favorite point!

No man, in my judgment, can show that the new version of this passage expresses less glory, honor, dignity, divinity, than the common version. "*Think it robbery to be like God,*" is an uncouth barbarism as respects sense and style, and does not reach the meaning

and spirit of the original; and how perfectly exempt the new version is from the imputation of Mr. Smith, will appear from one fact, viz.—The only translator which we know that uses words almost identical with ours, translates Acts xx. 28. as Mr. Smith would have it done. An anonymous translator, of very great merit, whose work we have, renders this difficult passage thus—"Did not affect to appear with divine majesty;" and the same gentleman renders Acts xx. 28. thus—"Feed the church of God which he has purchased with his own blood." This fact proves two propositions: The first, that the new version is not liable to the imputation of Mr. Smith, as leaning intentionally to one side of a long-vexed question; and also, that we are not servilely the followers of any man or set of men, inasmuch as we sometimes repudiate, and sometimes adopt the version of the same translator; a species of independence and impartiality which Mr. Smith cannot understand. We are with the poet—*Nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri.*

The phrase which respects the divinity in this verse, is the first in this sentence—"*Who being in the form of God.*" The latter, "*Thi·k it robbery to be equal to God,*" proves nothing favorable to the views of Trinitarians, as they themselves admit. The former phrase, because a literal and just translation, we retain: the latter is a mistranslation, as Whitby, Macknight, Grotius, with many others, affirm. Will Mr. Smith say that the following critics are to be suspected of heterodoxy—Whitby, Macknight, Erasmus, Adam Clark, and those authorities alluded to in the following extracts.—

"I cannot but add what I think is very material, that not one of the primitive Christians, who lived before the Council of Nice, as far as appears, understood this phrase in the same way our translators do. The testimonies of the churches of Lions and Vienne in France, in Euseb. Histor. Eccles. Lib. v. chap. ii. Origen on John, p. 34, and Novatian De Trinit. chap. xvii. are very clear to this purpose. Nor was the common interpretation contrary to the sense of the Antenicene Fathers only, but of some of the Postnicene also, as is evident from the testimony of Hilary, a very zealous advocate for orthodoxy, De Synod. p. 258. De Trinit. lib. viii. p. 111, 112. and of Phæbadius, Tom. 4. Bibl. Patr. p. 178.

This is so plainly disagreeable to the sense of the phrase, that it has been rejected by Erasmus, Schmidius, Grotius, Archbishop Tillotson, Bishop Bull, and others, whom no man will suspect of being partial in favor of the notion against which this text is frequently alleged.

"As to the other phrase *to einai isa Theou*, which our translation renders *to be equal with God*, Dr. Whitby has by many examples clearly shown that it often imports no more than *to be like* God. If we suppose that *morphe Theou* and *isa Theou* denote the same thing, it will not seem very proper or indeed consistent to say, that while he had the former he did not covet the latter."

The word *arpagmos* is found in no other Greek book, and is used by no writer save Paul. It is supposed to be synonymous with *arpagma*, and indeed this phrase cannot be translated literally to make sense in our idiom. A free translation, such as we have given, is better sustained by all the critics we have quoted, and corresponds better with the context than any other which we have seen. Moreover, it is as orthodox as the common—yea, *more* orthodox, if we take a full view of the whole connexion.—[*Adam Clarke.*]

"But the word *arpagmon*, which we translate *robbery*, has been supposed to imply a *thing to be seized, coveted*, or *desired;* and on this interpretation, the passage has been translated, *who being in the form of God, did not think it a matter to be earnestly desired, to appear equal to God; but made himself of no reputation*, &c. However the word be translated, it does not affect the eternal Deity of our Lord. Though he was from eternity in the form of God, possessed of the same glory; yet he thought it right *to veil* this glory, and not to *appear with it* among the children of men; and therefore he was made in the *likeness of men*, and took upon him the *form* or *appearance* of a *servant;* and had he retained the appearance of this ineffable glory, it would, in many respects, have prevented him from accomplishing the work which God gave him to do; and his *humiliation*, as necessary to the salvation of men, could not have been complete. On this account, I prefer this sense of the word *arpagmon*, before that given in our text; which does not agree so well with the other expressions in the context. In this sense the word is used by *Heliodorus*, in his *Æthiopics*, lib. vii. chap. 19, &c. which passage Whitby has produced, and on which he has given a considerable paraphrase. The reader who wishes to examine this subject more particularly, may have recourse to Heliodorus as above; or to the notes of Dr. Whitby on the passage."

Mr. Smith next adduces 1 Tim. iii. 16:—

"1 Timothy iii. 16. For confessedly great is the mystery of godliness. *God was manifested in the flesh*, was justified through the Spirit, &c.—*Macknight.*

"Confessedly great is the mystery of godliness. God was manifested in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, &c. *Doddridge.*

"Confessedly great is the secret of godliness. *He who was manifested* in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, &c.—*A. Campbell.*

"Macknight in his note in this passage remarks that "the Clermont MS. with the Vulgate and some other ancient versions here read, 'O, *which*, instead of *Theos*, *God*," but adopts without hesitation the common reading. And yet Mr. Campbell gives the reader no hint to apprize him that he is not reading, all the while, the translation of Macknight and Doddridge."

There are three readings of this passage sustained by various copies—God [*Theos*] was manifest in the flesh; who [*hos*] was manifest in the flesh; which [*ho*] was manifest in the flesh. Benson, I presume, will not be suspected of heresy by our Episcopal friend. Hear him:—

"By the *mystery of godliness*, I understand the whole Christian revelation, (which is now a *revealed mystery*) and one particular of which was Christ being preached to the Gentiles, and they accepted without any subjection to the law of Moses.

That our Lord Jesus Christ is elsewhere called *God*, and that justly and properly, is plain and evident; but it is dubious what was here the ancient and genuine reading.

That *ho* [*which*] should be it, is what I cannot easily assent to, though it is found in some manuscripts and versions of great repute; but it maketh the sense and connexion so awkward, that I cannot easily believe it was the word St. Paul made use of, particularly that *a mystery* should be said to be *manifested in the flesh*, sounds harsh to our ears, and is a sort of phraseology unknown to the New Testament, whatever may be said as to *anelephthe en doxe*, ('*taken up in glory.*') But that *hos* [*who*] should be the original reading, is not improbable; for it secureth a good connexion, is warranted by some manuscripts and Fathers, and is said, both by Liberatus the deacon (Breviar. chap. 19.) and by Hincarmus, (Opuscul. chap. 18.) to have been changed into *Theos*, which, according to the ancient way of writing them, might be done with one small stroke, thus—ΟΣ, ΘΣ.

But what chiefly confirmeth this, is, that for three hundred and eighty years this text was quoted by only one or two, if by any of the Catholic Fathers, even when they were writing directly in defence of the *divinity* of our Lord Jesus Christ; and it is dubious whether the Alexandrian MS. did not read ΟΣ, for it hath evidently been tampered with by some later hand. See Dr. Mills on this text."

Mr. Smith surely knows that we have followed Griesbach's corrected Greek text, and not the interpolated and incorrect Greek text from which the common version was made.

Thus have we disposed of so much of the evidence adduced by Mr. Smith in favor of his assumption, and we hope to be as successful in all that remains. I can now appeal to his honor and reputation for candor and honesty, to give both sides to his readers, as I have given both sides to mine. EDITOR.

Letters, &c. to A. Campbell.

[CONCLUDED.]

I DO not wish to impeach your motives or undervalue your labors. I have, as many of my Methodist friends can bear me witness, always declared it as my opinion that you are conscientiously doing what you believe to be the will of God. But what I would entreat of you, is, not to think or speak so uncharitably of your brethren—men who can fearlessly appeal to God for the sincerity of their hearts, and to men for the fruit of their labors. If you think us wrong, give us more sound logic and less biting sarcasm, and, I must say, in some instances, of low and vulgar ridicule. If we are in the wrong, and live in mystic Babylon, so, my dear sir, were you not long since. Many now living in this Western Country, can remember when all your learning and fine talents were employed (doubtless honestly) in the support of what you now call *mystic theology* and *scholastic divinity*. Now do you think that your reformation would have been promoted by the application to you of the language you now apply to us, when you once bantered a Methodist preacher to dispute with him the universality of Christ's atonement, (which I believe you now preach as well as Methodists,) do you think he would have acted like a Christian by calling you *an impure viper*, and telling you that you lived in the *Babel of antinomianism?* We think we are sincere in our religious opinions—that we are serving our God and his Christ—we have heard your explanations and attended to your strong reasons; but are not yet convinced of error. I have read with attention your Extra on the Remission of Sins, but remain yet unconverted. I have no doubt of your sincerity when on your laborious tour through Kentucky and Tennessee, exposed to dangers, preaching remission of sins by immersion, and *only* by immersion, you, like the good Bishop of Marseilles, "drew a purer breath when Nature sickened and each gale was death." Both of you doubtless were alike sincere in your religious opinions: you, in the belief that sins are remitted only in

immersion; and he, in the belief that in the act of consecration the wafer is actually turned into the body and blood of Christ. I respect you both for your talents and piety, but am not a convert to the opinions of either of you.

Be patient with us, friend Campbell, gently chide us for our tardiness in not believing all that you prophesy; but do not provoke us to wrath by calling us by hard names and threatening us with immediate destruction. If once this fire of hell is kindled, in its smoke neither of us will be able to see the truth. Perhaps you will justify yourself in your course towards your brethren of other sects, by saying they have impeached your motives and applied to you uncharitable epithets; and that in this work Methodists have not been behind their brethren of other denominations. If this be true, I can only say, I am sincerely sorry for it. Of this sin, as an individual, I can plead not guilty. That you have been frequently misrepresented, and as often treated in an uncharitable manner, I readily admit; but I would ask you calmly to review your past and present course, and say whether this is any thing more than returning evil for evil. Have you not been, and are you not still, frequently the assailant? So far as I am capable of judging in this matter, I must say, that according to every view I can form of a censorious unchristian spirit, your writings are decidedly the most so of any which I have seen of modern times. You often wantonly impeach some of your brethren; and when you provoke some of them to retaliate, you cry out, Persecution! What proof of this have you given in your correspondence with Mr. Cassedy on the subject of Sabbath mails? All who petitioned Congress to have the mail stopped from running on the Sabbath are held up as hypocrites by you and Mr. Cassedy, aiming to unite Church and State. Now be it known to you and Mr. Cassedy, that many Christians of different denominations united in this petition, whose characters for intelligence stand as high in this nation as either yours or his, and whose patriotism and piety are above suspicion.

One instance more, if you please. On what authority have you ventured to attack the religious character of the venerable Chief Justice Marshall? In your account of Christianity in Richmond, you say, Chief Justice Marshall is in his usual good health and attends church *once-a-year*. Every man of common sense must understand this inuendo. As I read it, I instinctively felt that you had offered an insult to every American citizen. The moral and religious character of Chief Justice Marshall is above suspicion; and for ability in the discharge of the duties of his high office, he is not surpassed by any man on earth: but he has not joined in your reformation, and is among "the impure brood" that God will judge. This is sufficient to expose him to your censure. Now so venerable a name as that of our Chief Justice ought not to be bandied about in this way in sectarian periodicals to gratify the spleen of bigots. What you say in the following quotations of the churches in Richmond, should have sufficed without descending to individuals:—"The *fashionable*, of the higher casts of society, *occasionally* visit the High Church, *read their*

prayers, and listen to the organ. The Presbyterians have tried *various projects* to get up revivals and extend the boundaries of their Zion in the South. They still erect brick churches, with tall steeples, and rear their horns like unicorns' above the Capitol itself, though it stands upon a sort of Tarpean hill. The Methodists, good folks, are more humble, and take root in all soils. Their synagogues are lowly, but capacious. *They catch the multitude because of their multitudinous accommodations to the nature of the multitude.*"

Now do you really think, friend Campbell, that this is respectful, to say nothing of its uncharitableness. You often mention sects and sectarianism in a manner that would lead your readers to believe that if a man has founded a sect, or belongs to one, he must be intolerant and bigoted. As the founder of a sect, you often mention the name of Wesley; and I am informed that in one of your public discourses, in which you were setting forth the importance of *immersion*, you said, "Wesley saw this doctrine plainly, but did not preach it: the consequence was, he had gone to *destruction*." Now, my dear friend, I do not consider Wesley *infallible*—he had his failings and errors as well as other men. I no more believe his doctrine of witchcraft and possessions, than I do yours in the importance of immersion. Wesley was a great religious reformer; but there is nothing in all his writings which I so much admire as his truly catholic spirit. In this respect I can fearlessly recommend him to you as an example of Christian forbearance. He suffered a thousand times more persecution than you have ever done; but with what meekness and humility did he bear it! Where, in his controversial writings, will you find him calling his brethren of other sects an "*impure brood*"? His religious feelings in relation to his brethren of other sects are plainly expressed in his sermon on a catholic spirit. I will extract from this excellent sermon several passages, which I wish you to compare with the quotations I have made from your writings in the commencement of this address:—

"Although a difference in opinions or modes of worship may prevent an entire external union, yet need it prevent our union in *affection*, though we cannot think alike? May we not *love* alike—may we not be of one *heart*, though we are not of one *opinion?* It is an unavoidable consequence of the present weakness and shortness of human understanding, that several men will be of several minds in religion as well as in common life. So it has been from the beginning of the world, and so it will be until the restoration of all things. Nay, further, though every man necessarily believes that every opinion which he holds is true, yet can no man be assured that all his opinions, taken together, are true. To be ignorant of many things, and be mistaken in some, is the necessary condition of humanity. I say, perhaps he cannot know, for who can tell how far invincible ignorance may extend, or invincible prejudice, which is often so fixed in tender minds that it is afterwards impossible to tear it up; and unless we know all the circumstances attending the case, we know not how far the individual is culpable.?"

After noticing the variety of opinions existing among good men, he says, "And how shall we choose among so great a variety? No man can choose for, or perish for another; but every one must follow the dictates of his own conscience; nor has any one power to constrain another to walk by his own rule. God has given no right to any of the children of men thus to lord it over the consciences of his brethren.

"I dare not, therefore, presume to impose my mode of worship on any other. I believe it to be primitive and apostolical; but my belief is no rule for another. I ask not, therefore, of him with whom I would unite in love, Are you of my church, of my congregation? Do you receive the same form of *church government*, and allow the same church officers with me? Do you join in the same *form* of prayer with me? I inquire not, Do you receive the supper of the Lord in the same *posture* and *manner* that I do; nor whether, in the administration of baptism you agree with me. Nay, I ask not of you (as clear as I am in my own mind) whether you allow baptism or the Lord's supper at all. Let all these things stand by. My only question at present is this, Is thy *heart* right, as my heart is with thy heart?

"But what is properly implied in this question? The first thing implied is this—Is thy heart right with God? Dost thou believe his being and his perfections, &c.? Dost thou believe in the Lord Jesus Christ? Is he revealed in thy soul? Is thy faith filled with the energy of love? Art thou accordingly laying up treasure in heaven? Is thy heart right towards thy neighbor? Dost thou love as thyself all mankind, without exception? Do you love your enemies? Is your soul full of good will and tender affection towards them? Do you do them all the good you can? If thou art thus minded, may every Christian say, Yea, if thou art but sincerely desirous of it, and following on until thou attainest it—then "thy heart is right as my heart is with thy heart—if it be, give me thy hand." I do not mean, be of my opinion—you need not—I do not expect or desire it; neither do I mean I will be of your opinion—I cannot. You need not even endeavor to come over to me. Let all opinions alone on one side and the other—only give me thy hand.

"I do not mean, embrace my modes of worship, or I will embrace yours—this also is a thing which does not depend on your choice or mine. I believe the Episcopal form of church government to be scriptural and apostolical. If you think the Presbyterian or Independent better, think so still and act accordingly. I believe infants ought to be baptized, and that this may be done either by dipping or sprinkling. If you are otherwise persuaded, be so, and follow your own persuasion.

"My sentiment is, that I ought not to forbid water, wherein persons may be baptized; and that I ought to eat bread and drink wine as a memorial of my dying Master. However, if you are not convinced of this, act according to the light you have—I have no desire to dispute with you one moment upon any of the preceding heads—let all these *small points* stand aside. Give me thy hand. I mean, love me

as a brother in Christ, a fellow-citizen of the New Jerusalem—as a companion in the kingdom and patience of Christ—love me with a love that coverest all things, is always willing to think the best, to put the fairest construction on all my words and actions. I mean, secondly, commend me to God in all thy prayers. I mean, thirdly, provoke me to love and to good works. Speak to me as thou hast opportunity, in *love*, whatever thou seest for my soul's health; quicken me in the work of God; smite me friendly and reprove me. O speak, and spare not. I mean, lastly, love me not in word only, but in deed and in truth, so far as thou canst in conscience. Join with me in the work of the Lord as far as you can. Speak honorably, whoever thou art, of the work of God, by whomsoever he works," [not *sneeringly*, as you have spoken of all the Christians in Richmond,] "and kindly of his messengers.

"From hence we may learn, first, what is a catholic spirit. It is not speculative latitudinarianism—it is not an indifference to all opinions. This is the *spawn* of hell. A man of a truly catholic spirit is fixed as the Sun concerning the great branches of Christian doctrine. From what has been said we may learn, secondly, that a catholic spirit is not any kind of practical latitudinarianism—it is not indifference to public worship."

Now, my dear sir, compare the sentiments expressed in the above quotations by Wesley towards his brethren of other sects, and those you express in the quotations I have made from your writings, and let *heaven* and *earth* judge whether you or Wesley is the bigot.

Mr. Wesley was, indeed, the founder of a sect; but he was not a bigot: and if those who belong to his sect ever become intolerant and bigoted they can never plead his example in justification. Go thou and do likewise.

A union of feeling, of sanctified affection, such as Wesley describes, and such as the Lord of love requires, may be attended to; but a union in opinions, either in relation to ceremonies or doctrines, can never be obtained on earth, nor does the great and important interests of Christianity require it. An attempt to effect this is *vanity*, and will be found to give rise to *vexation of spirit*.

I hope you will pardon me, dear sir, for having said so much. If I have wounded your feelings by any improper expression, I am truly sorry for it. God knows I have no wish to increase the bickerings and uncharitable feelings which prevail to so great an extent among the followers of Christ. I mourn this evil in the church of God. It is the bane of christendom. The true philosophic Christian would rather do away this monstrous evil than to be the author of all the the dusty volumes with which the shelves of polemic divinity have groaned since the days of the famed Aquinas and his great opponent Dun Scotus. It is sanctified affection, friend Campbell, that we want. Without this, with all the orthodoxy of the Bible, we are nothing but "a sounding brass or a tinkling symbol." I have felt it my duty to say thus much to you—a duty I owe to you as an intelligent friend, who has always treated me personally in the most gentlemanly and Christian

manner, through a friendship of many years—a duty I owe to your brethren, many of whom I respect as pious Christians—a duty I owe the church with which I am connected, who

"Sought me when a stranger,
Wand'ring from the fold of God,"

And has for many years nursed me with the solicitude of a kind parent—a duty I owe my God, who has counted me worthy of the ministry of his Son Jesus Christ—to whom be glory forever!

J. A. WATERMAN.

Reply to Mr. Waterman.

Dear Sir,

I THANK you for allowing me the merit of sincerity. This, however, with me is a virtue of but subordinate value. There are sincere Turks, Jews, and sceptics of every school—sincere Catholics and Protestants—sincere Methodists and sincere Calvinists. But so long as sincerity will not convert error into truth, nor truth into error, it has but little efficacy upon the heart; and is, therefore, no means of salvation. We all allow a hypocrite does great homage to truth; for he feigns a regard for it, though it be contrary to the bent and inclination of his heart. He is, therefore, a despicable character. No man can, indeed, be a good man, unless he be sincere, or honest in his pretensions; but yet goodness and sincerity are not convertible terms; for a man may be the worse, as well as the better, for being sincere. Paul was the worse, or more violent persecutor, because he was sincere in it; and had it not been for the sincerity of many of the enemies of Jesus, they would not have been so bitter against his friends—they would not have thought that the killing of them was a service most acceptable to God.

There appears to be as much virtue in sincerity as there is in the blood of Christ, if the praises daily offered to this idol are to be taken as proof of the esteem in which she is held by many. Sincerity saves all; and, like the altar which sanctifies the gift, it makes acceptable the rites of the worshipper's of Mahomet—the oblations of the Hindoo, the Jew, and sectaries of every name. It has brought salvation to the votaries of every creed; and finds Jehovah in Jove, and Jesus in Saturn, and all the graces of the Spirit in the Queen of Heaven.

But, my dear sir, while I hold the hypocrite in the superlative of contempt, I pay no homage in the temple of the goddess Sincerity, because she cannot make a truth out of a lie; and if God save men by "the sanctification of the spirit and *the belief of the truth*," as one Apostle affirms, the sincere belief of a lie will not constitute any man a saint, nor save his soul from sin. But I will halve the difference between us here if possible, and confess that the insincere acknowledgment of the truth is as valueless as the sincere belief of a lie. The *truth*, then, you will perceive, must, in my judgment, be sincerely believed, or there is no value in it. I have a few counterfeit bank

bills, which I once sincerely believed to be genuine notes; but my sincerity availed me nothing when they were presented in Bank. They were not worth a cent in the dollar.

You next challenge me on the ground of my having once preached mystic theology. This will go as far to disprove the premises from which I now argue, or the conclusions which I have deduced, as it would have disproved the Protestant religion to have reminded Luther that he once preached the Catholic faith! It is true that the faith which I inherited from my ancestors was once with me the true faith; and if I had not examined the foundation on which those opinions rested, with some degree of candor, and practised a little-self-denial too, I might, like many of my contemporaries, have thought that it was safer to follow a multitude than to think for oneself. If I ever did "banter a Methodist preacher to dispute the universality of the atonement," (of which, by the way, I have no distinct recollection,) it was very probably with a reference to the whole system of which that dogma was a part. And it is more than probable I would still dispute with many Methodist preaches about the representations which they give of the "universality of the atonement." Though I once leaned very strongly to particular election, special calling, particular redemption, &c. I would not run into the opposite extreme, and affirm that the Arminian must be right because the Calvinist is wrong; for I am still of the opinion that the two systems meet at last in the same metaphysical dogma—just as A and B, who, with back to back, started, one with his face to the East and the other with his face to the West, from the city of Jerusalem—after travelling round the globe, met face to face at the antipodes of the Holy City.

You tell me you are not converted by reading the Extra on Remission. I do not doubt it, because you seem to have read it so superficially as not to have understood it; or, shall I think that you understood it and misrepresented it? You have placed me in a dilemma, whether to impeach your understanding or your heart. You say that I "preach remission of sins by immersion, and *only* by immersion," (you have italicised the word *only*, not I,) and compare me to the Bishop of Marseilles, who made the consecration of the wafer the conversion of it into flesh and blood. No wonder you were not converted to what you do not understand! How shall I escape from the dilemma in which you have placed me? I will rather ascribe it to your head than to your heart: for you, like Homer, sometimes nod.

But every one who reads the *New Testament* is not converted. If a Volney or a Voltaire should tell you that he has carefully and sincerely read your Bible, but is not converted, would you resolve the difficulty by finding fault with the Bible or with him? Clergymen are of all other men the most inconvertible. It was not (Luke says) till multitudes of the common people believed, that a great company of the priests became obedient to the faith.

Did you ever sign a petition to have the mail stopped on the Sabbath? There never was one presented to me. Neither Mr. Cassedy nor myself represented the signers of those petitions as hypocrites.

For my part I regarded them as very sincere—though I presume you imagine that they were not all saints who subscribed them. Perhaps some of them were too sincere. I unfortunately suspect that there was more of political management in this affair, than of concern for the Lord's day. This may be my misfortune, but there can be no hypocrisy in avowing it. I view with jealousy sectarian zeal. I know what it has done, and therefore I fear what it may do. Besides, it is beginning to work at the wrong end. Let us first make the tree good—*convert Congress;* for an evil tree cannot bring forth good fruit. I ask for no congressional enactments for the Lord's day. What would you think of an act of Congress to make all men take "the sacrament" every Sunday? Then guess how I regard legislation in behalf of Christian institutions. And what would you have Congress to do for the Jews—the Sabbatarians, who regard the seventh day as holy to the Lord?—Pass no act of Congress for them because they are few in number! but because the professors of a Christian Sabbath are more numerous, legislate for them! This is in keeping with all the legislation of all ages and nations in favor of a national religion. Pardon me for a passing remark, extorted by the violence of your censures on me for expressing myself freely, but not fully, on the proscriptive and sectarian efforts of a party to control Congress in its measures.

'Why,' you ask, 'have I attacked the religious character of the venerable Chief Justice Marshall?' Why, let me rather ask, do you thus accuse me? There is none of the rulers of our nation, with whom I have a particular and personal acquaintance, that I esteem more highly than the venerable Chief Justice. For good sense, sound wisdom, uncorrupted integrity, profound knowledge of our institutions, and extensive acquaintance with all that pertains to his office and duties, he has, in my judgment, no equal on this continent, and no superior on the other. I hold it to be a positive proof of his good sense and sound discretion, that he so seldom goes to the Episcopal Monumental Church. Strange perversion! that you should, like the courteous Bishop of Marseilles, by a single touch of your pen, convert my encomium on the good sense of our Chief Justice into an attack upon his religious character! You say that every man of common sense must view my remark on his going *once-a-year* to the church (to see if they were doing any better!) as you have done I would beg leave to correct this remark by amending it so as to read, 'Every man of *uncommon* sense must regard,' &c. but every *charitable* gentleman would have understood it as I have explained it. I presume, however, you wanted an occasion to compliment the Chief Justice, and the honor of vindicating his piety from "the spleen of bigots"—and therefore I have been happy in affording you an opportunity.

But now, in turn, let me ask, Why do you attack the Christian reputation of the advocate of Christian perfection, (John Wesley himself,) by asserting that "he had failings and errors as well as other men"? But you say there is nothing in all his writings you admire

more than "his truly catholic spirit." All historians who record the sufferings of the first Christians, under Nero and Domitian, and even Trajan, state that the cause of all these persecutions was the want of a *truly catholic spirit;* for these Christians would acknowledge no intercommunity of religion with any but those who acknowledged Jesus as the only Saviour and kept his institutions. This was called bigotry and obstinacy; and for this Trajan swore they deserved to die.

While I admit, without reluctance, that John Wesley breathed a very catholic spirit, in its fullest acceptation with us moderns—I must, however, add, that this trait in his character has not such charms in my eyes as it seems to have in yours. While I hear you commending this catholic charity, I am thinking about the two mothers that appeared before Solomon about the beginning of his reign. They both claimed the living child, and neither would own the dead child. The hypocritical mother was by far the more charitable of the two; for, said she, Let it be neither yours nor mine, but let it belong to both of us. But the true mother would have it whole and alive, or not at all.

Is not Paul your model of a catholic spirit and of true charity? And his motto was, "Let every man be accursed who does not preach the same gospel I do." You are not authorized to say so, because you are not an infallible judge in the case; yet the better we understand and the more highly we appreciate the gospel which Paul preached, we become the more jealous of its purity, and the less favorable our opinions of those who change a word or letter of it. As men recede from the original gospel they grow in the world's esteem and in charity for the world; and as they approach to it their charity will be less catholic, but more scriptural.

While we have John Wesley before us give me leave to add, that I could wish, for my own sake and for my brethren's sake, that a double, rather than a fractional portion of his catholic spirit had fallen upon all his Elishas. I know a man who, not many moons since, and perhaps you are still better acquainted with him than I am, (one of Mr. Wesley's greatest admirers)—who, in scornful allusion to myself and my brethren, talking of getting religion, sneeringly said, he "wanted that religion which came down from above, and not that for which men must dive to the bottom of some creek or pond." This, of course, pleased the profane, and insulted the good sense of all who remember that Jesus himself was buried in the Jordan, and that all his ancient disciples were buried with him in the water of the pools, and ponds, and rivers of Judea—not, indeed, *to get* religion, but because they *had got* it, and had so much reverence for the institutions of Heaven as to submit to them with all cheerfulness and joy.

As you have given me an extract from one of Mr. Wesley's sermons, I will, in thankful return of the compliment, request you to read his sermon showing that the first Christians met every Lord's day to break the loaf. I cannot refer you to the page, as I have not the work before me, but you will find it under the head, "*Do this in remembrance of me.*"

One word more on Mr. Wesley's views of baptism and I dismiss him for the present. He has as distinctly said, as I or any reformer ever did say, all that we plead for as peculiar to baptism. In his comment on the New Testament, page 350, his words are, "Baptism, administered to real penitents, is both a *means* and a *seal* of pardon. Nor did God ordinarily, in the primitive church, bestow this pardon on any, unless through these means." However, then, Mr. Wesley might differ from us in his theory of charity and a catholic spirit, he is practically as uncharitable as we in this most capital point. We never said more, and I would not now say less, than the good, and catholic, and charitable John Wesley has here said.

I shall have to crave your indulgence, as I cannot finish my reply till my next. Meanwhile accept the assurance of my continued benevolence.

EDITOR.

The Gift of the Holy Spirit.

NO. II.

IN our last, having ascertained the import of the phrase, "*the gift of the Holy Spirit*," to be the Holy Spirit himself *given*, as foretold by Joel—we proceed to examine some other phrases employed by the Spirit himself in setting forth the effects of his residence in men. Be it observed that the Holy Spirit is himself a *gift*. He is not the donor, but the donation. He never gives himself. This is the philosophy which explains the reason why no inspired man, saint, or Christian, till John's death, in the year of the world 4100, ever prayed *to* the Holy Spirit, asked him, or thanked him for any thing. We address and thank the donor, not the gift. The unscriptural prayers addressed to the Holy Spirit, and the hymns sung to him by those who study theology in the schools of human philosophy, and not in the church of God, show the state of biblical knowledge in this "enlightened age of benevolent enterprize"!

Jesus himself, after his baptism, received the Holy Spirit. In the form of a dove he descended upon him. God gave him this gift. John the Immerser says, "To him God gives not the Spirit by measure." (John iii. 34.) Singular phrase! "The Spirit by measure"! What can it mean? The Prophets had received the Spirit by measure. By measure he was given to the Prophets—not by measure to the Son. They spoke not always, and not only, the words of God; but, as John explains the phrase in the preceding verse, Jesus spoke only and always the words of God. The Spirit of the context is this:—"Jesus whom God has sent speaks the words of God; for God gives not the Spirit by measure *to him*." "*To him*" is a supplement, but a necessary one; else God always gives the Spirit without measure.

With respect to this word "*measure*" in reference to the Spirit, it is only found in this passage; unless we understand Romans xii. 3. and Ephesians iv. 7. as referring to the same subject. "The measure of faith," (Rom. xii. 3.) is explained ver. 6, as denoting gifts spiritual. So in Eph. iv. 7. "To every one of us is given grace (*charis*) according to the measure of the gift of Christ." This "*gift of Christ*" is explained (verses 8 and 11) as expressive of the offices of apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, teachers. These offices, and those that filled them, are the gift of Christ alluded to; for when he ascended to heaven he received the promise of the Father, and gave gifts to men. These gifts were the *measures* of the Spirit. "The measure of the gift of Christ" is the measure, or distribution of that Spirit which Christ on his ascension sent down.

Be it observed that the creation of an office is a gift; and the qualifications of the person who fills that office is also a gift or grace bestowed on the church: "Having, then, gifts differing according to the grace (office) given to us—if prophecy, let us prophesy according to the measure of faith, according to the gift of prophecy which we enjoy," &c.

No one person, it appears, possessed the Holy Spirit himself without measure. The Head of the Church had this pre-eminence; or, in other words, no person was so possessed of the Spirit as to be only and always under his guidance and entire influence, except the Messiah. One prophesied—another had gifts of healing—another, of speaking foreign languages—another, of interpreting these foreign languages. The Spirit *distributed*, or gave what measures he pleased to every person on whom he was bestowed.

For it is evident that the Spirit himself, though a gift, displayed his presence in the spiritual men by such measures or distributions of his power as seemed good to himself. Hear Paul, (1 Cor. xii. 9—11.) "To one, indeed, is given by the Spirit, the word of wisdom; to another, the word of knowledge, according to the same Spirit; and to another, faith (to attempt a miracle) by the same Spirit; and to another, the gifts of healing, by the same Spirit; and to another, the operations of powers; and to another, prophecy; and to another, discerning of spirits; and to another, diverse kinds of foreign tongues; and to another, the interpretation of foreign tongues." Now all these (measures of himself) does the one and the same Spirit effectually work, distributing to each respectively as he pleases." These are the spiritual gifts, portions, or measures of the Spirit, bestowed by himself on those to whom he was given.

Having, then, from these examples, ascertained that such is the meaning of the phrases, "measures," "distributions of the Spirit," or "spiritual gifts," an inquiry arises, Did every one who possessed the gift of the Holy Spirit, or every one on whom the Spirit himself was bestowed, in the scriptural acceptation of the phrase, possess and exhibit such "*a manifestation of the Spirit*" as those described, thereby investing him with superhuman power? Such a question can only be answered correctly by an induction of all the particular cases

mentioned in the New Testament, or by a definition of the terms found in the Record on this subject.

Be it remembered, that in proposing such questions, we have supremely in view the determining of the meaning of the words and phrases in current circulation in the times of the New Institution, or during the apostolic age. Our present inquiries extend no farther. The question now before us may be varied so as to bring up another New Testament phrase. For example—Is every measure, distribution, portion, or gift of the Holy Spirit recorded in the Living Oracles, *a manifestation of the Spirit?* To proceed with deliberation and with confidence, let us first examine the phrase, "*manifestation of the Spirit.*" 1 Cor. xii. 7.

Phanerosis, (rendered *manifestation*, Old Version and New,) occurs but *twice* in the Living Oracles. Paul is the only writer who uses it, and he only uses it once in each of his letters to the Corinthians, 2d Epistle, chap. iv. 2. "By manifestation of the truth, commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God." The word PHANEROO, which signifies *to make manifest, to disclose, to bring to light*, occurs more than fifty times: from this is derived PHANEROSIS, *manifestation, exhibition, disclosure.* It is quite obvious, then, that all the *measures, gifts*, or *distributions of the Spirit*, were visible, sensible, and manifest to all: for they are called "*manifestations of the Spirit.*" In writing on "spiritual gifts," (1 Cor. chaps. xii. xiii. and xiv.) in the opening of the subject, Paul (chap. xii. 7.) classifies them under one general head, which he denominates "a manifestation of the Spirit" "There is a manifestation of the Spirit given to every man, [all the spiritual men,] for the advantage of all, [the brethren."] Then come the specifications of these manifestations of the Spirit before enumerated—"To one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom," &c. &c. If, then, by "a manifestation of the truth" Paul meant such a public and sensible exhibition of it as would commend the honesty and sincerity of the heart to every man's conscience, by "a manifestation of the Spirit" he meant such an exhibition of his presence and residence in the heart, as would convince the understanding of all that these spiritual men, who professed to have received the Holy Spirit himself, did in truth possess that divine agent. From all which, may it not be inferred that a person in the apostolic age, professing to have received the gift of the Holy Spirit, or the Holy Spirit himself, without a manifestation of it; or who who was unable to display it by some unequivocal exhibition of it, would have been considered either a knave or a simpleton?

Before we approach nigher to the question before us, there is another scriptural phrase, so similar to this, used by the same inspired writer, and in the same epistle, which deserves a passing remark. The intelligent reader will no doubt think of "*the demonstration of the Spirit*" found 1 Cor. ii. 4.—"I came not to you, brethren, with excellency of speech and of wisdom. My discourse also and my proclamation were not with persuasive words of human wisdom, but with the demonstration of the Spirit and of power, that your faith might

not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God." We quote the whole passage, that the import of this word, "demonstration," (*apodeixis*,) which occurs but once in all the Living Oracles, may be duly felt. The verb *apodeiknumi*, (to demonstrate,) occurs Acts ii. 22—xxv. 7.—1 Cor. iv. 9.—2 Thess. ii. 4. Jesus Christ was recommended [demonstrated] to you by God by powerful operations, wonders, and signs which God wrought by him in the midst of you." Thus the verb is first used, Acts ii. 22.; and from this we learn what is called a *demonstration of the Spirit*. "They were not able to prove [to demonstate] their accusations against Paul." Acts xxv. 7. "God has *set forth* us [demonstrated us Apostles] Apostles last as persons appointed to death." 1 Cor. iv. 9. "Sitting in the temple of God, openly showing [demonstrating] himself to be a god." 2 Thess. ii. 4. With all the premises in the Book, the reader may now see that a *demonstration of the Spirit* is a public, evident, sensible display of supernatural power, on which the faith of a person may stand as on the power of God; or such a manifestation or exhibition of the Spirit, evincing, beyond rational doubt, that he is no knave or vain pretender who says that he has received the gift of the Holy Spirit.

Perhaps our question is already sufficiently answered to the satisfaction of the reader. Was every one mentioned in the volumes of God as possessing the gift of the Holy Spirit, able to give a manifestation or demonstration of the Spirit? This is the question now before us; and it is proved two ways—either by an induction of all the cases which we have not yet attempted, or by a definition of all the phrases employed to express the meaning, design, or extent of the gift of the Holy Spirit. The latter is more immediately our object—the other is rather a consequence drawn from the premises fairly exhibited and examined This much we may say, and it must suffice for the present essay, that, when the scriptural import of the phrases "*the gift of the Holy Spirit*," "*spiritual gifts*," "*measure*" or "*distribution of the Spirit*," "*demonstration of the Spirit*," is fully and clearly ascertained, they all indicate a "*manifestation of the Spirit*." And perhaps it may be inferred that no man ever did possess the gift of the Holy Spirit, who could not, and who did not, afford a manifestation of the Spirit. For every manifestation of the Spirit, says Paul, was given to every spiritual man for the advantage of all; and unless the demonstration of the Spirit was to all, it could not be an advantage to all.

Let none of the admirers and believers in "physical and moral operations of the Spirit"—in "common and special operations"—in "divine influences," be alarmed at this investigation of the matter. We are now ascertaining from the proper authority, (the Scriptures themselves,) the true and only authorized meaning of the sacred dialect. When we discuss the merits of these popular and ecclesiastic terms and phrases, we shall not use the Bible, but the creeds and commentators of modern christendom. Meanwhile, it is Bible words and Bible ideas only we are prying into.

EDITOR.

Conversations in Father Goodal's Family Circle, at Mr. Reed's.

[*Continued from page* 164.]

Mr. Reed. I HAVE the pleasure of introducing to Father and Mother Goodal some friends from the land of our fathers—Mr. and Mrs. *Payne*, of England; and Mr. and Mrs. *Cunningham*, from the north of the Tweed. They have already been introduced to the rest of the company.

Father Goodal. "God has made of one blood all the nations of men that dwell on all the face of the earth." I, therefore, feel a common interest in all our race; but yet I feel the influence of local attachments, and that the current of my philanthropy is a little diverted by the attractions of country and kindred. What news from England, Mr. Payne?

Mr. Payne. All hopes of peace with France are vanished. The ministry is determined on prosecuting the war. They affirm that Bonaparte is insincere in offering negociations at this time. The proceedings of the Consul at Milan, Modena, Genoa, Venice, Malta, and Egypt, are urged as decisive evidences that no confidence is to be reposed in this military chieftain; and, accordingly, the war is to be prosecuted with more vigor. A new loan of half a million of money has been voted, and negociations are recently entered into with the Duke of Wirtemberg and the Elector of Bavaria for soldiers. In brief, the army of Conde and the Swiss regiment are actually taken into the pay of England. It was expected in Liverpool, at the time of my sailing for Belfast, that Parliament would engraft a large portion of the militia into the regular army, and would adjourn in about three weeks.

Father Goodal. Bonaparte is destined to be the scourge of Europe; and I think that England will be grievously scourged by him, whether successful or unsuccessful in this war, and she richly deserves it too. But, Mr. Payne, what is the state of religion in England at this time?

Mr. Payne. Religion, Mr. Goodal, at Court do you mean, or in the country generally?

Father Goodal. Religion at Court! Since the days of *Pharaoh* Court religion is a matter of policy. It may change its name, its forms, its ceremonies; but it is always political—an alien from God and from reason. I wish to hear of religion among the common classes of society. If I know how it flourishes amongst these, I can conjecture all the rest.

Mr. Payne. The best news I can give you on this subject, is, that a project has been got up in London, as announced by *The Times* of last week, for getting up a Bible Society, and several Lords spoke favorably of it.

Mother Goodal. A Bible Society! Are the Lords and Earls about to form a society for reading the Bible along with the lower classes?

Mr. Payne. Not for *reading* the Bible, but for having it *printed* without notes or marginal references, and gratuitously distributed among the poor.

Mother Goodal. The rich are, then, going to give the Bible to the poor without price. That is very kind. I wish they would read it a little more themselves, and I could have more faith in their donations of it.

Mr. Payne. They are, Madam, too much engrossed in politics to read a book which condemns their own course; but they wish the poor, who have more leisure, to read it, that they may be the better subjects of the King, and more willing to support the government.

Father Goodal. I am glad to hear that the Nobility are about to take an interest in this matter, be their motives what they may. I like to see the rulers of the people respect the Bible, though it should be a feigned respect. The common people will not be ashamed to read it, when the rich and noble unite to patronize it. But what sect has proposed this measure, Mr. Payne?

Mr. Payne. It would seem to be a sort of amalgamation of sects: for I learn, there is to be no creed allowed in the Society, but the naked text; for

in this only are they agreed, that the text is from *God*, and the comment from *men*. Ministers of different Protestant denominations are engaged in getting up this society, and many very honorable gentlemen are named as about to be members of it.

Father Goodal. Bless the Lord! This is certainly honorable to our nation, and a signal triumph of the Bible over the atheistic coalition of France.—What a triumph! The Bible dragged through the streets of Paris, by the public hangman, not three years since, and now a society is to be formed in the English Capital, composed of ministers of all Protestant denominations, and of English Lords and Noblemen, to send it through all the world! If this be not placing the *Two Witnesses* in heaven, whose bodies lay unburied for three years and a half in France, (the Street of the Great City of Babylon,) I am fully persuaded that it is the omen or precursor of some great event. Perhaps it augurs the fall of sectarianism! This is the best news I have heard these ten years. The Lord be praised!

After a long pause, the ladies sang the hymn which ends in these words—

"Fly abroad, thou mighty gospel!
Win and conquer—never cease!
May thy lasting, wide dominion,
Multiply and still increase!
Sway thy sceptre,
Saviour, all the world around!

Father Goodal (turning to Mr. Cunningham) said, And what good news from Scotland, Mr. Cunningham?

Mr. Cunningham. There is nothing new in Glasgow of general interest. The city re-echoes with the praises of Mr. Wilberforce. Although it is more than four months since his motion was lost in Parliament, his speech on the abolition of the slave trade is as fresh as other speeches are in one week after they arrive from London. Perhaps it is because I mingle more with the friends of abolition in that city, that I hear more of it. But the change of public opinion on that vital question is so great, that I believe, though his motion was lost by thirty voices, he will eventually succeed in his object.

Father Goodal. And there is hope, you think, that that cursed traffic in human flesh will yet be abolished as far as the English power is felt? Well, next to the triumph of the Bible, I should hail the abolition of the slave trade. I am ashamed that atheistic France should have gone farther than our nation in abolishing that trade.

Mr. Williamson. This recalls to my mind a question which I felt disposed to ask the company when I heard Father Goodal say that "God made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth." The question is—If all men are of one blood, how comes it to pass that all men are not of one color?

Mr. Reed. Our young friend, Robert Fowler, is a great student of nature. He was telling me the other day some of his speculations on that subject. If he will give us a sketch of his reasonings, I think it will satisfy the whole company that the black man and the white are certainly of one blood; and, moreover, that the change of color, so far from being a curse, is a real blessing, an argument for the benevolence of God, and a proof of his kind providences in behalf of man.

Mr. Cunningham. Is it possible that I have found one that agrees with me so exactly in theory on that interesting subject!

Robert Fowler. I am not able, Mr. Cunningham, to form any theory on this curious subject, and I have read but little on it. As you agree with me so far as I have expressed myself to Mr. Reed, will you please assist me by stating your views upon the question?

Mr. Cunningham. I would by no means anticipate you. The reason I speak of your theory is, that the conclusions to which you have come flow rom my premises, and therefore I presume we reason alike on the subject.

Robert Fowler. Indulge me, then, so far as to give an *expose* of your views, and I will add any thing I may have to say when you are done.

Mr. Cunningham. My theory is, in brief, comprehended in a few observations on Providence; or, rather, it is a part of my general theory of Providence. We all, who study nature, know that there is a wonderful adaptation of all vegetables and animals to the climates in which they are found; and that man, who is the inhabitant of every climate, is the great object for whom all these adaptations exist. It is therefore presumable that man himself is adapted to all the climates in which he is obliged to live. Now as far as color is concerned, there are physical reasons which demand a change of color in order to the comfort of the subject. This is marked in every species of animals. As you approach the North all animals become white. This is a general law of the animal kingdom. The reason is, *White reflects the rays of the Sun, and Black absorbs them.* White, then, doubles the heat, and black diminishes it. In advancing to the line man and other animals become blacker. And even in the course of a single year, as the seasons advance in heat and cold, the color of most animals change. As the Sun withdraws from the Tropic of Cancer towards the South, and consequently the northern latitudes become colder, the squirrels, wolves, hares, and bears of the North become whiter; and even the birds of the same species in the course of the year change with the seasons, especially those who travel South. Hence the *willow*, the *cardinal*, the *swallow* are much blacker in the hottest part of the season. The white bear of the North and the black bear of America is a sample of this. The inhabitants of the torrid zone are the blackest of our species, as the inhabitants of the icy regions are the whitest. I say this is the general law; and the reason is, the benevolence of the Common Parent, who adapts all things to the comfort of his creatures. The forests of the North, because the habitation of man and beast, are warmer than the open fields; while the forests of the South are cooler. The broad leaves of the southern growths make a cool shade, while the sharp-pointed, glossy, and narrow foliage of the North reflect the heat, and make the pines of Siberia warmer than the palms of India.

Mr. Williamson. Why, then, are the Africans black, and those in the same latitudes copper colored?

Mr. Cunningham. The long belt of sand which passes through the torrid parts of Africa, makes it very much warmer than the same latitudes of America. Besides, the Indians constantly rub themselves with *roucou*, (sweet-scented paste.) Again, their country is clothed with immense forests, and filled with the vapors of its mighty rivers. Besides, their country rises gradually from the shores to the mountains of Peru, and thus elevating itself in the atmosphere, it is kept comparatively cooler. Add to these considerations, strong east winds, night and day, blow through those warm latitudes in America, which greatly diminish its temperature, when compared with the dry, flat, arid sands of the torrid zone in Africa.

Mr. Williamson. But do the inhabitants of other countries, who migrate into the torrid zone in Africa, become black?

Mr. Cunningham. Most unquestionably! The Jews have become black in Africa; and the Moguls, who migrated from the north of Asia, whose very name signifies *white*, are at this day as black as the nations of India, which they conquered.

Mr. Williamson. But are the differences in the hair to be assigned to the same cause?

Mr. Cunningham. Yes; no tissue of wool is more crisp than the hair of the African, which, more effectually than any turban or head-dress, shelters them from the oppressive heats of Africa. The inhabitants of the Indian peninsula are as black as the Africans; but the constant wearing of turbans has caused their hair to grow long and smooth as the hair of the copper-colored Americans.

Robert Fowler. To these observations, from which I have reasoned myself into the same convictions, I can only add that I see no more reason in denying

an identity of blood or nature to all nations, because of the change of color, than in denying that a black, a grey, or a brown horse is of the same species, because of a different color.

Mr. Williamson. While on the subject of *blood*, I am prompted by a young gentlemen on my right to inquire whether virtue and vice may not be, in some measure in the blood, as indicated by the character of certain tribes and families in Europe and America for a series of generations.

Mr. Reed. This question, I am aware, arises from some remarks made the other day by a clergyman (somewhat eccentric I must confess) on the subject of marriage. His discourse on *family* and *blood* might have led one to suppose that there were certain moral attributes in blood—that some families were of better, and others of worse blood, as respected moral endowments. He asserted that some were constitutionally honest, and others hereditarily knavish; and in effect made temperament, blood, and ancestry more powerful than education in forming even virtuous and vicious habits.

Robert Fowler. Curious as the question is, I am convinced that it is pertinent to the tenor of that discourse as reported to me by Mr. Flemming. And the instances adduced by the preacher gave it an air of plausibility exceedingly captivating. But in looking into my favorite author, I found the following passage, which itself alone disproved the whole theory. Will you read it, Mr. Reed?

Mr. Reed. It is as follows:—"I beg leave to ask, In what instance was an inclination to vice or virtue known to be communicated with the blood?—Pompey, so noted for his generosity, was the son of Strabo, infamously notorious to the Roman people for his avarice. The cruel Domitian was brother to the gracious Titus. Caligula and Agrippina, the mother of Nero, were, indeed, brother and sister; but they were the children of Germanicus, the darling hope of Rome. The barbarous Commodus was son of the divine Marcus Aurelius. What a difference is frequently observable in the same man, between his youth and his mature age; between Nero, saluted as the father of his country, when he mounted the throne; and Nero, execrated as its avowed enemy before his death: between Titus, stigmatized with the name of a second Nero, in his youth, and Titus at his death, embalmed with the tears of the Senate, of the Roman people, and of strangers, and transmitted unanimously to posterity as the delight of mankind?

"It is not climate, then, which regulates the morality of man. It is opinion—it is education; and such is their power, that they triumph not only over latitudes, but even over temperament. Cesar, so ambitious, so dissolute; and Cato, so temperate and virtuous, were both of a sickly constitution. Place, climate, nation, family, temperament, no one of these, and in no part of the world, determine men to vice or to virtue. They are every where free to choose."

Mrs. Goodal. This is the best argument I have yet heard in favor of the power of education. If a Roman education could do so much, what may not a Christian education accomplish? If a Nero could be converted into a Titus, what Christian parent need despair of bringing up his children for the Lord?

"These weapons of the holy war,
Of what almighty force they are,
To make our stubborn passions bow,
And lay the proudest rebel low!

Mrs. Reed. Father Goodal's remarks upon the Bible Society project, and on the diverse treatment of the Bible in the French and English Capitals, prompt me to propose

The Two Witnesses

as a question to the present company. I have heard much said about these *Two Witnesses*, and have as yet not been fully satisfied.

Mr. Cunningham. This subject is exciting much attention in Scotland at

this time. I would infer from Mr. Goodal's remarks upon the Bible, that he agrees with certain Scotch theologians on this query. They contend that the Two Testaments are the 'two witnesses.' From his remarks upon the elevation of the Bible in London, the Capital of the Protestant religion, as the exaltation of the Two Witnesses, I infer that he concurs with them.

Father Goodal. That is not exactly my opinion. I own that the tabernacle of the congregation is called "*the tabernacle of witness*" four times in the Old Testament and once in the New, because in it was God's testimony. And the volume called the Old Testament may be called a witness for God, because of the Prophets found in it which spoke for God. So may the New. But if I must distinctly give my opinion on that question, I will say that the Prophets and the Apostles are the *Two Witnesses* spoken of in the 11th chapter of the Apocalypse.

Mr. Williamson. How can all the Prophets and all the Apostles make but *two* witnesses?

Father Goodal. Just as two hundred and fifty Popes make one "man of sin." They all have one spirit and one object. The succession, however long, is a unit—one series of men sustaining one office.

Mr. Williamson. Had not the Apostles and Prophets one Spirit and one object; and are they not, therefore, one witness?

Father Goodal. So has all nature and all the Bible one spirit and one object —namely, to glorify God. But we may be too general as well as not general enough.

Mr. Williamson. Please, then, define; for I had thought that if unity of spirit and of object constitute a number of persons one witness, then the Apostles and Prophets make but one spirit and one witness.

Father Goodal. All the Jewish Prophets spoke for God; the Apostles of Christ all speak for Jesus as his Son; and they both agree in one testimony. But yet they are two distinct classes of witnesses. Therefore, it is said, 'The church is built upon the Apostles and Prophets'—as *two* witnesses for God and for his Christ. They are two separate and independent classes of witnesses as any two individuals who attest to one and the same thing. The Apostles appealed to the Prophets as witnesses, and Jesus called the Apostles his witnesses.

Mr. Reed. So far I am with Father Goodal. Bible names are our safest guides. Jesus says, "You are my witnesses to the ends of the earth." Thus he constituted and called the Apostles his *witnesses.* They gave one testimony. "Whether it were I or they, so we all preach," says Paul. "He that is of God heareth us, [Apostles;] he that is not of God, hears us not," says John. They give one testimony, and are, in contrast with the Prophets, one witness. The Prophets give one witness concerning God's Messiah; and though many, they agree in one testimony, and make one class of witnesses.

Mr. Williamson. I have heard some of our New York Doctors say that the two witnesses were those who witnessed against political and ecclesiastic usurpation and tyranny—a succession of men pleading for political rights, and a succession of men pleading for church rights.

Father Goodal. Each of God's two witnesses plead for both. The Prophets reproved all wicked kings and rulers, as well as spoke for God and his people. So do the Apostles reprove all injustice as well as speak for the Messiah. There is no impropriety in separating these two duties of one witness. Besides, it would be incongruous to call the Atheists and Sceptics of Germany, France, and England, who plead for the people's rights against kings and princes, *God's witnesses.* I choose rather to say, that the Apostles and Prophets, in speaking for God and his Anointed, reprove all sorts of iniquity in nations—both immorality and impiety.

Mr. Cunningham. A difficulty occurs to me against this novel view, which I will mention: How can the Jewish Prophets, who spoke for God before the times of the Messiah, be now regarded as one of the two witnesses for Jesus Christ?

Father Goodal. The testimony for Jesus is the spirit of prophecy; or rather, all the Prophets are now witnesses for Jesus Christ as much as his Apostles. To us who hear not the voice of the Apostles, the testimony of the Prophets is as essential to our faith as the words of the Apostles; and our faith rests as much upon the one as upon the other of these two witnesses. The figurative two witnesses with me, then, must be the same two classes of witnesses on which our faith stands.

Mr. Williamson. What think you, Mr. Goodal, about their prophesying in sack cloth?

Father Goodal. This is in unison with the figurative two witnesses; for the Jewish Prophets literally, in times of apostacy, prophesied in sack cloth. So common was it for the Prophets in the times of delinquency (which were generally the times in which they prophesied) to clothe themselves in sack cloth as a sign of mourning, that Zachariah said of impostors, "They shall no longer prophesy in sack cloth to deceive the simple." This is a strong corroboration of my views of the two witnesses; for the Prophets and Apostles have prophesied in sack cloth twelve hundred and sixty days.

Mr. Reed. A very strong—to me it appears an *irresistible* argument in support of Father Goodal's view of the two witnesses, is found in Rev. xviii. 20. after John saw the Man of Sin de'hroned, and Babylon the Great in which he reigned visited with the last plagues—he heard a voice from heaven exultingly invoke not only the saints in heaven, but the Apostles and Prophets, to rejoice in the ruin of Babylon, "*because on their account God has pronounced sentence upon her.*" Why on their account? Were they not gone to heaven before the Man of Sin was revealed? And what injustice had they received at her hand? No personal indignity, it must be conceded. What then? In their testimony—in their rejection from the temple of God, and banishment from the church by Mystery Babylon the Great. The time of their wearing sack cloth is now terminated; for sack cloth they shall be girded with gladness. "Rejoice over her, you holy Apostles and Prophets, for God has avenged you on her."

Father Goodal. This, with me, is conclusive. But again, the whole imagery of the figurative representation of this prophecy corresponds with this view better than with any other. "These are the two olive trees, and the two lamps which stand before the rightful Lord of the whole earth." Like Elijah, they torment the wicked rulers—they call for fire upon the heads of their enemies—it rains only by their word. At their banishment and degradation these wicked rulers rejoice. They are finally translated to heaven. This was true in detail of some of the first class of witnesses. And the figures are easily interpreted in their application to the testimony and treatment of the two witnesses.

Mrs. Reed. I can now easily see how they were taken up into heaven. For if the volume which contains their testimony is now to be honored by the rulers of the Protestant Capital, and by them to be sent on the wings of every wind to all nations, as contemplated by the Bible Society; and thus the testimony of the Apostles and Prophets separated from all human traditions and human institutions, I cannot predict the glory and honor which await their word.

Mr. Williamson. I have some difficulties on the subject yet. They lay dead and unburied for three days and a half. What does this mean?

Mrs. Reed. But supper waits.——— EDITOR.

Letter from J. Buchanan, Esq.

British Consul at New York.

NEW YORK, 28*th February*, 1834.

Sir—IN your Millennial Harbinger, No. 1, Vol. 5, you have published "Notes on a Tour to New York, No. 5," in which you state,

"There are three small bodies holding one Lord, one faith, and one immersion, which, for some years, have not sat down at the Lord's table, each having its own table;" and you further set forth, "Hence these good brethren erected three tables suited to their respective views—one in Lauren's street, one in Hudson, and one in Canal street; holding at the same time one faith, one hope, one immersion, one body, one Spirit, one Lord, and one Father, but *of different opinions on some of the doctrines of men;*" that, "after some reflec tion, you united with the brethren in Hudson and Lauren's street, inasmuch as they would unite with each other." Permit me, sir, as a member of the church of God assembling in Canal street, to observe, that were the matters you state correct, namely, that the three societies had the one faith, one hope, one immersion, one body, one Spirit, one Lord, and one Father, the two societies you associated with should not have been separate from the one body which now assemble in Canal street. That body had for its Elder the late dearly lamented William Ovington, who was among the first who came together as a church of God in New York, above 20 years ago, holding and uniformly contending for the one faith, one hope, one Holy Spirit, one immersion, and attending to the order of a church as set forth in Acts ii.; and from that he never departed while in life, and in death afforded another seal to the truth of God's word, that in the valley of death his word would comfort and sustain all who trusted in him. Many of the members in Hudson street formed part of the body over which Elder Ovington was an overseer; and Dr. Barker, who presides over a body which meet in Lauren's street, formerly denominated "General Baptists," withdrew from the church in Canal street. Therefore, sir, if two bodies have remained separate and distinct from the body over which Elder Ovington presided, who, with those who remained with him, and who, since his falling asleep in the Lord Jesus, have continued steadfast not only in, but contending for the one body—yea, for every one acknowledged a member of the body, holding openly, honestly, and faithfully in the sight of God, their hope of eternal life, as set forth in that one faith, one hope, one Holy Spirit, as confessed at their immersion. The sin of not holding the one body, but of erecting a diversity of tables, does not lie at the door of the church in Canal street; and pardon my saying, in the most unqualified terms, that the separation of any who withdrew from the church associated with Elder Ovington, *did not arise from the church holding or requiring obedience to opinions or some doctrines of men*, as you have been pleased to charge upon the church in Canal street. No doubt from ignorance of the true facts you have done so, and we trust to your faithfulness in rendering this vindication as general as the statement; and I further beg leave to state, in vindication of the church in Canal street, that I have never heard the charge brought against it that it had departed from the one faith, the one hope, the one Lord, the one Spirit, or the one immersion; and I feel I may confidently say, that whenever any one of the members of the two societies who sit at different tables (and thereby show that they do not hold the one body, and

with whom you united,) are willing to declare their belief in the one faith, one Lord, one Holy Spirit, and in one immersion, in the plain and simple terms as set forth in the Holy Scriptures, and manifest a ready submission to all the commands of the Lord Jesus and his Apostles, to the entire exclusion of all measures of expediency, and every doctrine of man; however weak any may be in the faith, with open arms and hearts full of love and joy will the church in Canal street unite with them at the Lord's table, and, forgetting the things which are behind, endeavor, by divine aid, to promote each other's zeal in running the race set before us, looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith, and thereby manifest we are the disciples of the Lord Jesus by loving one another.

Elder M'Briar not having been in the church when the events referred to arose, leads the writer to address you. Should any observation or expression bear an unkind aspect, or unnecessarily cast a reflection on others, I beg to assure you such is not my wish. To vindicate the church of God, of which it is my greatest honor and glory to be an humble member, alone calls forth this letter. I wish also in candor to state, that whatever intercourse may have arisen in consequence of your visit to this city, or whatever apparent agreement may exist between our views, that, until we become more fully acquainted, I am not to be considered as according with your conclusions; and believing that the Holy Spirit is spoken of in the work of salvation, and in carrying it on, I feel constrained, as well as a high privilege, continually to ask the aid of the Holy Spirit to give effect to the word in my heart and the hearts of others, as well as for holding me up against the devil, the flesh, and the world, (not to free me from, but to enable me to triumph over temptation,) so that the glory of my salvation and my holding fast to the end is all to be given to God.

I pray God to prosper the labors of all engaged in making known the Saviour, and seeking the restoration of apostolic practice in the churches, as set before us in the New Testament. May the Holy Spirit guide you, and sanctify your labors, and lead the churches to glorify the Lord and only Saviour in all things!

I remain an unworthy sinner, justified freely by grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.

J. BUCHANAN.

Reply to J. Buchanan, Esq.

Dear Sir,

I THANK you for the statement you have given of your views of the causes of disunion among those who do acknowledge one Lord, one faith, &c. in your city; and, as you regard it as a "vindication of the church of God in Canal street" from the charge alleged against them in the "Notes," &c. alluded to, I will, with the greater cheerfulness, lay it before that same public addressed in the document containing said charge. I would not, my dear sir, impute to any professor of the Christian faith an error, however trivial, which he is

unwilling to admit, and still less to yourself and brethren in Canal street, for whose intelligence and sincerity I entertain so high regard. The imputation of "holding or requiring obedience to human opinions or some doctrines of men," is, in your view, a charge preferred by me against the church of Canal street, and certainly it was equally preferred against the other bodies alluded to. You agree with me, that the charge is fairly and justly alleged against the other two, but unjustly against the body who meet in Canal street. I have no doubt but such is your opinion, and very probably it is the opinion of the other two bodies, that it more justly applies to the brethren in Canal street than to them. It is not, however, either my province or my wish to decide which of the three bodies is most censurable for the existing state of things, because this is not the way to effect union, and, because, were it desirable, it would require an investigation which the discovery might not repay. I felt authorized to say what I did, from the amount of information which I possessed, acquired from various sources, verbal and written.

At an early period of my editorial labors, a volume of letters, compiled and published by the church over which brethren Wm. Ovington and Henry Erret presided, fell into my hands. In that volume I found a letter bearing date March 1, 1818, signed by Deacons Jonathan Hatfield, James Saunders, and Benjamin Hendrickson, with the two Elders above mentioned, giving a history of the views and practices of "the church professing obedience to the faith of Jesus Christ, assembling together in New York." This is the mother church of the three bodies alluded to. The Elder of the Lawrence street church was one of its sons, and others of its members were found in that church. Brethren Hatfield and Ovington, now of Hudson street, were members of it; and, if I mistake not, those in Hudson street claim, by regular succession, to be the rightful heir and representative of the church of 1818. You, of Canal street, I see, refuse them this honor; and, if I am not much mistaken, there is a neucleus of those who separate themselves in religion from all men, some twenty individuals meeting in some other street of New York, who, in their own estimation, constitute the true and only church of Christ in America legitimately descended from the said church of 1818. But, although I republished the aforesaid letter of March 1, 1818, in Nov. 1827, in the 5th volume of the Christian Baptist, and several other letters out of the same volume, it was not with a full conviction that either the original gospel or primitive order of things were fully seen or understood by that said church. That there was in it much to approve, and much to admire, I then felt and still feel; but that there was such an infusion of the doctrines of men and of human opinions necessarily tending to the destruction of its foundation, I as distinctly saw as I saw the ground I had set out on in the Christian Baptist; and the sequel has, in my opinion, proved that my reasonings were well founded. I have just, at this moment, opened the Christian Baptist to see whether I did not then in my remarks appended to the publication of those letters, ex-

press some dissent from the principles and terms of your union as inadequate and unscriptural, and find that I am not mistaken in my recollections. A very just and liberal estimate of that to which you had attained, according to my now more mature deliberation, is expressed in the remarks alluded to. See vol. v. C. B. p. 234. 2d ed. And, although those remarks were made before you broke to pieces, and certainly before I heard it, you will perceive that the very principles which caused your dismemberment are sketched in those remarks as *the two greatest defects* in your system of procedure. The textuary plan of applying the scriptures, that Pandora's box of Protestant christendom, and your "unanimity of opinion in all measures and decisions," as the scriptural rule, indicated to me the calamities which befel you.

The very superscription of your letter of 1818, nay, the very salutation which you give to the churches, demonstrates how the technicalities of orthodoxy had embarrassed you. You could not say with Peter, with Paul, and all the other Apostles, "Grace, mercy, and peace be multiplied to you through the knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ our Lord"—or "from God our Father and Jesus Christ our Lord"; but you must season the Christian salutation with your theory of spiritual operations, and make it read as follows;—"Grace, mercy, and peace be multiplied from God the Father *by the Holy Spirit*, through our Lord Jesus Christ." A hint is enough for the wise. No Apostle or Prophet ever prayed for God to bless his word, or to bless his grace—or taught that grace, mercy, and peace from God was to be multiplied by the Holy Spirit to saint or sinners. Jealousy cannot be concealed from the eye of discernment, neither can a morbid sensibility in physics or religion be hid from a person of discrimination. I adduce this only as an instance of what I mean when I speak of the textuary mode of applying the scriptures, and in vindication of my charge, that "different opinions in some of the doctrines of men," were the occasion of erecting three or four communion tables in the city of New York. A slight divergency at the place of departure of two rays from the face of the sun, causes the one to fall in Europe and the other in America.

These allusions to the old church in New York have been elicited by your recurrence to the past history. I do not wish to derogate aught from her intelligence, faith, zeal, purity. I only say, had it not been for certain humanisms, and leanings to old theories, while she professedly acknowledged only the Living Oracles, she might have remained to this day. But the nigher we approach the truth, and yet fall short of the full constitution of Christ's kingdom, the sooner we fall to pieces. The most egregiously astray society in christendom held on the longest. If we take the Bible alone, we must walk by the Bible alone, or we cannot walk at all.

The greatest deficiency in the order of things in the church of 1818, in my judgment, was its want of a due regard to the proclamation of the word, or to the conversion of the world, and this may have originated from some slight mixtures of human theory with the gospel

of God. It is very easy to make the word of God of non-effect. A little leaven, leavens the whole mass.

Your faithfulness to all men, my dear sir, and your great zeal for what you esteem to be the truth of God, justifies me in concurrence with my own convictions and responsibility, in speaking out on this occasion. I shall have, from incontrollable circumstances, to break off now in the midst of my reply.

Let me add, that it gives me great pleasure to learn from a source entitled to full credit, that the brethren in Hudson street, with other brethren in the city, are resolved that the table of which they partake shall be the Lord's table; they will unite with all disciples on the New Testament alone, and receive all who confess the Lord and are willing to obey him without regard to differences of opinion. They waive each and every consideration arising from a conviction that they were in fact the original church, and that the other bodies have gone out from them. They will impose no terms of communion, no theory of the work of salvation, other than the sayings of the Apostles. They, in one word, will rally around the grand principles of the reformation, and go with all their hearts into the work of regenating the world. Who, that loves Jesus Christ our Lord, will not say to them, God speed?

Very respectfully—I have the honor to be, with you, an expectant of the appearing of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

EDITOR.

J. T. HINTON.

THIS gentleman, by way of compliment for my remarks on his association sermon, and in demonstration and proof of his theory of conversion—administers to me a small portion of that good feeling, the fruit of his conversion, under date of the 21st of March last. Instead of an effort to sustain *the doctrine* of his discourse, like the scuttle-fish in danger, he colors the water and scuttles off in the darkness of his own emission in the words following, to wit:—"After this specimen of the veracious qualities of the Harbinger, I am confident my Christian brethren, and the public, will hold me entirely justified in declining to notice in future any statement which may appear in that publication." Perhaps he meant voracious! He is confident! The public will *hold* him justified! for *declining* to notice! any *statements!* which may appear! in that publication! What a flourish! What an insult to the good sense of this community!

Mr. Hinton, lately landed from England, boasts he never heard David S. Burnet nor A. Campbell; and, because I, on the testimony of certain persons, which I or they misunderstood in reference to a discourse preached by Mr. Hinton, represent him as embellishing its *exordium* with some extracts from a discourse delivered by brother Burnet, he has discovered that the *veracious* qualities of the Harbinger justify him in disregarding its exposure of his errors.

"I preached that sermon in Richmond before Mr. Burnet came to the city, or I had ever heard of his name." Grant it; and did he not preach it after Mr. Burnet came to the city, in more places than one; and did not Mr. Burnet deliver a discourse, making the same distribution of the subject—and might not some person take it into his head that he borrowed it from you, or you from him; and might not these circumstances be so reported by even credible persons as to authorize any one to believe that you were his debtor, or he yours, without destroying the *veracious* character of the believer!!

As to the other matters of displacing Mr. Kerr, the following documents are public property:—Mr. Sands, May 3, 1833, says in the Herald—"The First Baptist church in Richmond have invited the Rev. J. T. Hinton, recently from England, to become *assistant Pastor to the church*. Brother Hinton has accepted the invitation." Again, May 24, the same author says—"Ordination and protracted meeting. The First Baptist church have appointed Wednesday, the 5th of June, for the ordination of Elder J. T. Hinton as *assistant Pastor of the church*." I have not the paper now before me which gives an account of the ordination of this associate Pastor. But the question is, what has become of Mr. Kerr—and who is the *associate* Pastor now!

"As to his seeking to be the Magnus Apollo of the Dover Associatian"—no foreigner, it was said, ever made himself so conspicuous, on his very debut into a Virginia association, as did Mr. Hinton last year at Williamsburg. I was not there to see, it is true; but many witnesses declare, that no man rose oftener to address the house; none spoke more abusively of strangers who would not submit to his dictation; no messenger there interfered so generally in every thing; none took a more active part against the reformers. These are small matters, very small indeed: and, were it not that this is the defence of the theory of conversion which Mr. Hinton offers, I should not have noticed them at all.

I never was afraid to appeal to the Christian public—no, not even to the most prejudiced that would lend an ear, to sustain me in all questions of morality, however that public may differ from me in questions of theology. And if that public justifies Mr. Hinton for thus defending his theory of conversion, I have greatly mistaken its character. EDITOR.

Progress of Reform.

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

INDIANA, Pa. March 3, 1834.

To all Brethren who labor in the Word and Teaching.

THERE are a few of us in this place, Green township, Indiana county, Pa. who have dared to think for ourselves on the subject of religion, and have, as we think, commenced our march towards the heavenly Jerusalem in the midst of a sectarian people who use no other argument than that of calumny and

misrepresentation. We are far from any people who contend for the gospel in its simplicity; and on this account we have the more need of help as our opponents have a better opportunity to prejudice the minds of the people against us. And now, dear brethren, we wish you to come over and help us, as we think there might be much good done in this place if there were some person here who could ably defend the truths of the gospel. There are many in this place who appear much disgusted at the present order of things, but do not know where the error is. We hope this notice will meet with due consideration by our brethren, as we have nothing in view but the present and future welfare of our fellow beings, whom their blind guides, we are induced to believe, are leading to eternal ruin. If any brother should think proper to visit us, he will please signify his intention by addressing a letter either to John or James Lydick of this place.

JOHN LYDICK.

Brockport, Monroe county, N. Y. April 10, 1834.

Dear Brother—THE truth has at last in a glorious manner triumphed over error in several parts of this state. Our most sanguine expectations have been more than realized. During the past winter, several scores have been introduced into the kingdom of Messiah. I have spent most of the winter up to the present time, in travelling and proclaiming the good news. Brethren Moss, Bartlett, myself, and others have attended several meetings of some days continuance, which have been productive of much good. A particular account of them you will probably receive from some other source.

JOHN M. YEARNSHAW.

Madison, Ind. March 23, 1834.

Dear Brother Campbell,

Your favor of the 18th ult. was received by Mrs E. while I was absent for a few days, performing a short tour in Kentucky: but read by me with as much interest on my return as though it had just arrived. I was absent from this place from the 20th of Feb. till the evening of the 7th instant, during which time I visited Frankfort, Georgetown, Lexington, Shelbyville, Louisville, Ky. and Charlestown in this state; in all of which places I formed some acquaintances with brethren that I had never seen before; among whom were Ambrose Dudley, P. S. Fall, Wm. Johnson, J. T. Johnson, B. W. Stone, Challin, and Poindexter. At Frankfort, also, I was introduced to your friend Dr. Noel, who, I am informed, speaks much against the good cause of reform; yet seasons most of his sermons with some doctrine of the reformation. In Frankfort the brethren are struggling against much opposition. Brother Fall meets with them generally every first day. In Georgetown, I would judge, from what I saw and heard, that all is well. The union of brethren Johnson and Stone, and the brethren with them, has been productive of much good. While with brother Johnson, I attended three or four meetings, and one immersion: at the latter a brother from the Christian ranks *preached*. His doctrine was the old gospel, full and clear, without any *ifs* or *ands*. He said sixteen years ago I attended a big meeting at which several ministers were present, and much excitement was produced. Many were weeping and seemed concerned for the salvation of their souls. We invited them forward and prayed for them. We prayed fervently for their salvation: but it afforded no relief. We dismissed the meeting, and they went away sorrowing. An old minister then observed there must be something wrong in our preaching: for we read not of one instance like the present. In the Apostles' time the gospel they preached left no mourners on the ground. Yes, said the preacher, there was something wrong. We have found out what it was. We now preach reformation and the remission of sins; and those who obey are filled with joy.

F. W. EMMONS.

SPRUCE CREEK, Somerset county, Pa. Feb. 1834.

IN this place there is a congregation of disciples, between sixty and seventy in number, who live in peace and union. They adopt the New Testament for their only guide in all matters of faith and practice—meet every first day for the purpose of refreshing their memories by the incidents of Calvary. I need not add that great efforts have been made by the sects to counterbalance our labors—this seems to have been the lot of those that were on earth in the days of the Apostles. But truth is prevailing and will prevail from the rising of the sun to the place of its going down. Brother P. G. Young, an able proclaimer of the ancient gospel, was with us a few weeks since; it is expected that he will spend part of his time among us during the summer.

ELIJAH YOUNKIN.

PLEASANT HILL, *Mo.* 12, 1834.

THE cause of the reformation is gaining ground in this state. Truth is mighty and will prevail, although the opposition runs high. Permit me to observe that Catholicism is also gaining ground in this neighborhood. They are about erecting a Chapel within one mile of me. The Priest attends occasionally, and tells them some feasible stories, which they are induced to believe. They claim seniority over all churches, starting from the Apostles, making some people believe that they started in the days of purity and have themselves remained pure ever since—in a word, arose under the Apostles, and have kept their doctrines pure. Infatuated assertions! I have observed that you could, from your knowledge of church history, expose their errors and their origin. By so doing, at some convenient time, in the Harbinger, you would subserve the cause of truth as much, or more, than when you met the giant of infidelity in Cincinnati. They boast that in the Harbinger you attack all systems but the Catholic—asserting at the same that your conviction of its invulnerability is the reason of your silence. Your friend in the cause of truth.

DAVID JAMESON.

[☞I have held forth the Roman Catholic superstition as the climax of absurdity and impiety—as the mother of all abominations and sorceries in christendom. But, really, I did not think, till within a few years, that in the United States it needed to be touched. I thought that the history of the Old World was enough for the New on this subject, and I did not imagine that the sons of that tottering hierarchy would have the insolence, in the face of American light and liberty, to urge its claims, now nauseating to all the intelligence of Europe. But it seems it must be attended to. I am aware of this, and am on my way to expose its nakedness. Their Creed will appear in the present number; and after my Review of the Catholic Controversy, we will go on unto perfection.]—*Editor.*

JEFFERSON COUNTY, Ky. March 24, 1834.

Dear Brother—YOU have requested your correspondents to inform you of the progress of the reformation in their respective vicinities; and, as it is always more pleasant to publish good news than bad, I fear we often have a one-sided view of this important matter and that the same sectarian course, pursued by your opposers, (of which you have had so much reason to complain) would keep you and your readers from knowing the true state of the reformation; and permit me to say that, I consider the accession of thousands and tens of thousands to the reformation by immersion for the remission of sins, without good order in the congregations, and a perseverance in a holy life—is an injury rather than a blessing. A proselyting spirit is the spirit of this sectarian apostate age: and I am afraid to say that I have good news to write you, though I could tell you of fifty or a hundred, or even five hundred, who had just been baptized on a confession, without being able to subjoin that good order, peace, and holiness were maintained as the general character of the churches. As to the state of the disciples amongst us, there is much yet to be done in reforma-

tion—not merely to bring them up to the morality of the neighboring sects, but to bring them up to the standard of the New Testament:—

1. We have few or none who come up to the character or perform the work of bishops or elders.

2. There are but few who feel and understand the importance of meeting every first day to break the loaf and attend to all the duties of social worship.

3. There is a great neglect of family discipline in training children and servants in the instruction and admonition of the Lord.

4. There is too much conformity to the course of this world in dress and fashion—in idle, light, and chaffy conversation.

5. And finally, there is a great lack of self government, family government, and order and good government in our congregations to bring us to the order of the New Testament. I have had the pleasure, however, to immerse about twenty since I last wrote you—principally young persons: may the Lord keep them from falling and preserve them unto his heavenly kingdom!

BENJAMIN ALLEN.

[I would most gladly comply with the wishes of the sisters in Louisville at this time; but circumstances uncontrollable forbid. I will keep their wishes in mind. Ed.]

ABINGTON, *Ind.* February 8, 1834.

WE have at this time, in this neighborhood, a considerable number of persons that begin to "see men as trees walking." For a long time after I came to this place I stood alone as an advocate for the restoration of the ancient order of things. I then stood as a solitary mark, at which every person felt privileged to discharge his squib. But at this time I am not alone. Hundreds begin to see the necessity of reform. Many have taken the first steps towards reformation. A few only have declared themselves independent of the traditions and commandments of men, our number being about thirty. The little society of which I am a member owns no king but Jesus, and no creed but the Bible.

WM. J. MATCHETT.

PARIS, *Tenn.* February 3, 1834.

IN November brother M'Call visited this place, and advertised that he would deliver a discourse on the subject of the *Christian Religion*. The *novelty* of the topic, and the able manner in which it was handled, excited the attention of the citizens, and gained him a larger and more respectable audience than usual. He remained two or three weeks, preached 26 times, and immersed *into* remission of sins, 25 persons, men and women.

During the stay of brother M'Call a church was formed on the *word*, which was visited in December by brother Giles, who remained a week or two, and immersed four persons into Christ. The opposition of the sects is considerable; but it is surpassed by the faithfulness and courage of the Christians. Without any regular ministry, without any creed, or the aid of the popular breeze, the number of disciples has in three months increased from five or six to forty-five. Many of the brethren and sisters are talented, learned, and respectable, and not one is there who is not able to rejoice in his deliverance and is not anxious to make advancements in the knowledge of Christ and in holiness.

ALEX. GRAHAM.

KING WILLIAM, *Va.* February 3, 1834.

OUR brother Burnett has left us; and from the extensive field we have to cultivate, it is now truly necessary that we should have more laborers. To the west we are compelled to turn our eyes. Please, then, invite through the Harbinger, on the request of many of the disciples of eastern Virginia,, brothers Jacob Creath senr. of Kentucky and Aylett Rayns of Ohio, to visit us and aid, so far as it is in their power, in declaring the truth to the people, and

in building up the congregations of Jesus Christ our Lord and Master; and we will endeavor to remunerate them. That we may not request in vain, we solicit your aid through the same medium.

WILLIAM H. W. LUKE.
DUDLEY ATKINSON.
BUTLER EDWARDS.
JAMES EDWARDS.
JOHN DUVAL.

Some time since I recollect of seeing a request from you through the Harbinger, soliciting information as to the reformation from error to truth, that is plead for in the United States by yourself and many others; we would say, by way of return to the same, that even at this time it is progressing with us; and when we look back for the last twelve months, we view the number of from two to three hundred that have made the good confession, not only of reformation of life, but of him that bought them with his blood. We had a meeting at Bethesda a few days ago; some made the good confession. The church at Bethesda last winter only numbered from fifty to sixty. It now numbers one hundred and more. They have come through much tribulation and persecution from their old friends, the Regular Baptists, and the world.

W. H. W. LUKE.

Catholic Confession of Faith.

THE following summary of the Roman Catholic faith is extracted from one of their standard books of devotion, published under the authority and approbation of the Bishop. We present it to our readers in order that they may see at a glance what the prominent tenets of that church are, according to their own writers. Our readers will perceive that one fundamental tenet is the acknowledgment of the supremacy of the Pope as successor of Peter the Prince of the Apostles. As it is evident from the New Testament, that no such power was claimed or exercised by that Apostle in his lifetime, in what state was the primitive church in those days? Obviously, on this theory, in a state of condemnation. If to acknowledge Peter as the Vicar of Christ constitutes a Roman Catholic, it is evident, from the New Testament, that there were no Roman Catholics in the days of the Apostles—as Peter himself does not hint at such a thing in his Epistles. *Religious Herald.*

I, *N N*, with a firm faith, believe and profess all and every one of these things, which are contained in that creed, which the Holy Catholic [*Roman*] Church maketh use of, *to wit:*—I believe in one God, the *Father* Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord *Jesus Christ*, the only begotten *Son* of God, and born of the Father before all ages, God of God; light of light; true God of true God; begotten, not made; consubstantial to the Father, by whom all things were made. Who, for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnated by the Holy Ghost, of the Virgin *Mary*, and was made man. Was crucified also for us, under *Pontius Pilate:* he suffered and was buried: the third day he rose again, according to the Scriptures. He ascended into heaven: sits at the right hand of the Father; and is to come again with glory to judge the living and the dead: of whose kingdom there shall be no end. And in the *Holy Ghost*, the Lord and life-giver, who proceeds from the Father and the Son, is adored and glo-

rified, who spoke by the Prophets. And [I believe] One Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic *church*: I confess one baptism for the remission of sins, and I expect the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. *Amen.*

I most steadfastly admit and embrace apostolical and ecclesiastical *traditions*, and all other observances and constitutions of the church.

I also admit the holy *Scriptures* according to that sense which our Holy Mother, the Church, has held, and does hold them to which it belongs, to *judge* of the true sense and interpretations of the *Scriptures*. Neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

I also profess that there are truly and properly *Seven Sacraments* of the New Law, instituted by *Jesus Christ* our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all, for every one, *to wit.*— Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Order and Matrimony; and that of these, Baptism, Confirmation, and Order cannot be reiterated without sacrilege. I also receive and admit the received and approved *ceremonies* of the *Catholic* Church, in the solemn administration of the aforesaid sacraments.

I embrace and receive all and every one of the things which have been defined and declared in the holy Council of Trent, concerning Original Sin and Justification.

I profess, likewise, that in the *Mass* there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead. And that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist, there is truly, really, and substantially the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood; which conversion the *Catholic* Church calls *Transubstantiation*. I also confess, that under *either kind* alone *Christ* is received whole and entire, and a true sacrament.

I constantly hold that there is a *Purgatory*, and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.

Likewise that the *Saints*, reigning together with Christ, are to be honored and invocated, and that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be respected.

I most firmly assert, that the *images* of *Christ*, of the mother of God, ever Virgin, and also of the Saints, ought to be had and retained, and that due honor and veneration are to be given them.

I also affirm, that the power of *indulgence* was left by *Christ* in the church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to *Christian* people.

I acknowledge the *Holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church* for the Mother and Mistress of all Churches; and I promise true obedience to the *Bishop of Rome*, successor to St. *Peter*, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of *Jesus Christ*.

I likewise undoubtedly receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the Sacred Canons and General Councils, and particularly by the Holy Council of *Trent*.

And I condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies whatsoever, condemned, rejected, and anathematized by the Church.

This true Catholic faith, without which no one can be saved, I, *N N*, do at this present time freely confess and sincerely hold, and I promise most constantly to retain, and confess the same entire and unviolated, with God's assistance, to the end of my life. *Amen.*

R. B. C. Howel,

A PRESUMPTUOUS PLAGIARIST.

A CERTAIN *R. B. C. Howel*, of Norfolk, Virginia, said to be a Baptist preacher, but whose style is more like that of Pope Leo X. than of a Christian preacher, in the *Religious Herald* of the 11th April, after most uncourteously assailing brother *Hall* of Kentucky—calling him "a strolling Dentist of the name of *Hall*," (in imitation of that Roman soldier who called the great Apostle to the Gentiles "a strolling tent-maker of the name of Paul")—says, that I "knew that I was stating a malicious falsehood" when I accused him of committing theft on my Debate with Mr. M'Calla.

Now be it known to the said Mr. Howel, and to all who sustain him as a preacher, that I pledge myself, when put to the trial, to prove that this said Mr. Howel has, with his own knowledge and consent, published downright and palpable falsehoods* in this said article; and that, when furnished with a copy of his Sermon on Baptism, I can prove before any court that he is guilty of every thing I accused him—that he did, contrary to honor, law, justice, and equity, actually commit piracy on said Debate, and that to an extent, were it money or other valuable property, sufficient, even under our humane laws, to commit him to the Penitentiary for five years at least. We shall now see who states deliberate falsehoods.

APOLOGY FOR R. B. C. HOWEL.

As an apology for R. B. C. Howel, it may be stated that the piratical sermons above alluded to were not *spoken* by him, but *read* to his congregation. He, I learn from one of his quondam hearers, generally, or always, reads his discourses; and it is presumable that they are like Joseph's coat—well patched

*To blind the eyes and to quiet the consciences of his admirers, he confesses that he "availed himself extensively of the works on baptism of Drs. Gill, Gale, Stennett, Chapin, Baldwin, and Cox—Booth, Pengilly, Carson, Frey, and many others"—and amongst "*the many others*" he now says he meant my Debate with Mr. M'Calla. This is all a trick to conceal his guilt of denial; for he has made larger drafts on my Debate with M'Calla than on any of them, and, perhaps, than on all of them put together; for which he gives no credit—neither naming the work nor myself. Conscious of this, too, he has come out with another salvo; and fearing exposure on this plea, he lays hold of another. He says, "The principal assistance I obtained from Campbell's Debate, was the statement in some important particulars of the Pædobaptist arguments in relation to baptism." That is to say, he plagiarized more from Mr. M'Calla than from me. Why, then, did he not name M'Calla and give him credit?—! But this only exhibits a deliberate purpose to conceal his theft; for I boldly say, it is without foundation—it is no such thing. If he have stolen a cent from Mr. M'Calla, he has stolen a hundred from me. He has a third plea in case of detection on these two colorings. It is this: He and I both borrowed from the authors which he has named, and it is probable we might both express ourselves in the same words. This leaves not a shadow of doubt on my mind of a settled purpose to prevaricate and to hazard other falsehoods to conceal the capital one. Of all the works he has named, before my Debate with M'Calla, I had read but one; and of those he mentions, several were written *since my debate* with M'Calla.

There are Baptist preachers that oppose my views, whom I esteem both gentlemen and Christians—if we can suppose that a Christian is not a gentleman, (of which I have many doubts;) but so soon as I discover a hypocrite and a wolf in the garb of a sheep, I feel that I owe it to humanity—to the church—to the world—and to myself, to hold him up in his true character. If Mr. Howel agreed with me in every sentiment, discovering (as I now do) the mass of moral corruption concealed within, I would have fellowship with a sincere Catholic, who would tell the truth as far as he knew it, rather than with him.

from many authors. It is, moreover, probable that *he* often, as well as his *hearers*, does not know who speaks. Being so long accustomed to plagiarism, he may not remember those from whom he has surreptitiously enriched his discourses. Some characters need a good memory. But still whatever excuses might have been made for him on the plea of forgetfulness, when the matter was laid before him he ought honestly to have confessed his fault and asked for pardon, and we would have forgiven him. EDITOR.

Psalms, Hymns, and Spiritual Songs,

Original and selected—compiled by A. Campbell, W. Scott, B. W. Stone, and J. T. Johnson.—Bethany Va. 1834.

THE above work is just out of press, and in the hands of the book-binder. The following extracts from the preface will show the occasion and object of this work:—

"In presenting this hymn book to the brethren it is deemed expedient to preface it by a short expose of the causes which led to its appearance. About six months ago it was suggested to brother Campbell, that many other excellent songs, besides those which he had published, were still to be found in the various hymn books of the different religious parties; and that divers of the disciples were now anxious to have them in possession. Of these things brother Campbell was aware, and replied, that he should feel the highest pleasure in gratifying the disciples in relation to this matter—at the same time he signified to the writer that the care of it must devolve on both; and that we must publish the new hymn book conjointly. Brother Campbell's wishes in relation to this matter were acceded to; but soon afterwards it appeared to him that the whole affair might be attended to in a manner which was likely to render our labors still more acceptable to the brethren.

It is known to many of the disciples, that brethren Stone and Johnson have published a hymn book: there were of course two hymn books in the field at the same time; and the result was that some preferred one, and some the other. Hence, the two hymn books were not unfrequently found in the same assembly to the no small inconvenience of the disciples. As the best remedy for the evil, it was deemed most advisable by brother Campbell to make of the twain one new hymn book; and for this reason he addressed an epistle to the brethren Stone and Johnson, setting forth the inconvenience of having two hymn books, and requesting them to concur with him in the production of a new one, which should meet the exigencies of all the churches. This the brethren approved, and replied, that they deemed it a very necessary movement, and one to which they now most willingly acceded."—*W. Scott.*

It is published jointly by the persons above named,—and only such psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs as seemed to all adapted to the genius of the Christian religion, appear in it. As it is printed on a very fine paper, and has many songs in a small clear type, it is not so much larger in appearance than the former selections; yet it contains more than 240 pieces. It will be sold at 37½ cents per copy—$3,75 per dozen—and at 25 per cent. discount on the 100 copies paid at the time of filling the orders.

Experience has suggested the necessity of meeting an objection which, in this mercenary age, is to be expected. It is this:—'This new hymn book, displacing the former editions, is only designed to create a new market for the sale of a new work.' For myself and brethren I will state the following fact—The demand for the selection, which has undergone four editions, has been very great. I could have sold as many of them as I could find time to publish with my other works. I, therefore, give up the sole and exclusive right of publishing that work, and have now only ⅛ of the interest in the new book. This I concede to the wishes of the brethren who desired a larger selection. The same may be said in whole or in part of the book published by brethren

Stone and Johnson; it was a popular work. The last edition of it was, I am told, 3000. The last edition of ours was between 7 and 8000. The present edition of the new selection is 6000. I think these facts ought at least to satisfy all candid persons, that with me it is a matter of concession to the wishes of the brethren, at (what the mercenary spirit of the age would say) the sacrifice of my personal interest. Except it may be the alteration of a word or phrase, I must say to my brethren, that I think the present selection ought to satisfy all, and that I will not consent, as far as I can judge from the past and the present, to any new or material change in the work, or addition to it. ☞Orders addressed to Bethany—to Georgetown, and to Carthage, can, in a few days, be supplied.

EDITOR.

TO QUERISTS—AND THE EXTRAS.

I INTENDED in my last to have answered your Queries in this number, but I was too far advanced with its contents before I could find time to attend to them. Moreover, I have resolved, both from myself and the suggestions of brethren, to make the *Kingdom* or *Reign of Heaven* the subject of my next Extra—in which various questions concerning the ministry of John, his baptism, the commencement of the reign of Messiah, the doctrine of remission, &c. &c. will come in due course. As it will be some time before I can attend to this, our correspondents will favor us with their suggestions, difficulties, and queries as they may think proper. We shall thank them for all the assistance they can give us on this subject. At the request of many, it is probable that after the next Extra shall have been published, we may republish, in a duodecimo volume, a revised, corrected, and improved edition of all the Extras. The demand for them has been constantly increasing. Having distributed many thousands of them, we cannot supply any new demands.

EDITOR.

☞"THE APOSTOLIC ADVOCATE" is removed from Philadelphia to Richmond, Va.—Orders to brother *Thomas*, in that place, will be thankfully received and promptly attended to.

☞Remarks on S. M. M'Corkle's "Signs of the Times" in prospect.

FROM THE WATCHMAN

Paul before Agrippa.

THE son of Herod sat in regal state
Fast by his sister-queen,—and mid the throng
Of supple courtiers and of Roman guards,
Gave solemn audience. Summon'd to his bar
A prisoner came, who with no flattering tone
Brought incense to a mortal. Every eye
Question'd his brow,—with scowling eagerness,
As there he stood in bonds. But when he spake
With such majestic earnestness,—such grace
Of simple courtesy;—with fervent zeal
So boldly reason'd for the truth of God,
The ardor of his heaven-taught eloquence
Wrought in the royal bosom, till its pulse
Responsive trembled with the new-born hope
"*Almost*" to be a Christian. So, he rose,—
And with the courtly train swept pompous by.
——"*Almost!*"—and was this all, thou Jewish king?
Thou listener to the ambassadors of Heaven,—
"*Almost persuaded?*"—Ah! hadst thou exchang'd
Thy trappings and thy purple, for his bonds
Who stood before thee,—hadst thou drawn his hope
Into thy breast, even with the sharpest spear
Of martyrdom,—how great had been thy gain!—
——O, ye!—who linger while the call of God
Bears witness with your conscience, and would fain,
Like king Agrippa, follow,—yet draw back
Awhile into the vortex of the world,
Perchance to swell the hoard which Death shall sweep
Like driven chaff away,—'mid stranger bands,—
Perchance, by Pleasure's deadening opiate lull'd,
To false security,—or by the fear
Of man constrain'd,—or mov'd to give your sins
A little longer scope,—beware!—beware!
Lest that dread "*almost*" shut you out of heaven.

L. H. E.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Number VI.——Volume V.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Bethany, Va. June, 1834.

For the Millennial Harbinger.

Conscience---No. 3.

THE *origin* of conscience has been to many an important and interesting subject of inquiry. Mankind indeed, in general, seem to take great delight in pursuing every thing that is remote, in tracing effects to causes, and prying into the mysteries of the universe. There are few, perhaps, who would not, if in their power, gladly forsake the surface of the earth, and, prompted by curiosity, descend with the pearl-diver to survey the secret caverns of the ocean; or soar aloft upon angels' wings to examine Saturn's ring, the mountains of the Moon, or the wonders of the distant Herschel. So infatuated indeed are men with the pursuit and possession of whatever is remote and difficult to obtain, however worthless it may be, that there are few who would not rejoice much more in the discovery of some ultimate principle, the product of some desperate analysis, or in beholding the faint glimmer of some planet invisible to common eyes, than in the actual possession of a useful and necessary object. The naturalist will be happier in having by the aid of a microscope discerned an oak in an acorn, than if you made him a present of a perfect oak; and the astronomer would not exchange for the earth itself, the glory of having by means of a powerful telescope discovered in the sky an asteroid!

It would be well indeed, if the interest which men take in remote inquiries were always proportioned to their utility. If this were the case, many barren districts in the territories of Science would be no longer vainly cultivated; and uncertain theory and hypothesis would give place to obvious facts and useful knowledge. For it requires no great degree of penetration to discover that most of these critical investigations are wholly unprofitable, and incapable of being turned to any useful purpose whatever. As a general rule, indeed, the more minute the analysis, the more worthless the product; and these

far-fetched theories of mind and morality, which are founded upon such microscopical observations, are not only useless, but actually injurious, since men have, through their influence, wasted their lives in vain speculation, reasoning themselves out of the belief of the most simple truths, and out of reason itself—

"Curious Indigators! fond
Of knowing any thing but what avails them known."

We would not, however, be understood to say that the investigation of the origin and causes of things is always an unprofitable employment; for such inquiries are not always recondite. To trace creation to a great intelligent First Cause is highly profitable, but it is at the same time a simple and easy process, and such a Cause is necessarily inferred from such a display of wisdom and design as is exhibited in creation—as the existence of a watch-maker is inferred from that of a watch. But it is when we would enter upon the examination of *secondary causes*, and would seek to ascertain with accuracy the principles and powers which move and regulate either mind or matter, that we find ourselves involved in error and surrounded with inextricable difficulties. Any one could infer from the appearance and motions of the automaton chess-player, that it had a maker; but it would be a far different and more difficult task to explain the cause of those motions, and estimate and unfold the powers and uses of its secret springs.

That the examination into the origin of conscience has been no more successful than such inquiries usually are, is quite evident from its various and contradictory results. Some have come to the conclusion that it is found among the original furniture of the mind. Others have imagined it to be "a secret monition of the Divine Spirit"—a "still small voice" of inspiration; while a third class have asserted that it is created wholly by the power of education. That all these different conclusions cannot be true is evident; and since error is not better than ignorance, it might have been as well to have left the subject wholly unexamined. As these views, however, have originated in an erroneous definition of the term *conscience*, it may be well for us briefly to consider them, particularly as they have had much influence in deciding what degree of regard should be paid to the dictates of conscience; and if in our progress we do not find whence the latter does really spring, we may perhaps ascertain whence it does not—for it is always easier to detect error, than to discover truth.

To begin, then, with the last of these theories, viz. that conscience is entirely the result of education; although we must admit that education exercises a great influence upon conscience, that where there is no education there is no manifestation of conscience, and that it is modified and changed by the power of education; yet we are compelled to reject this view as incorrect, or at least imperfect, since it confounds conscience with *knowledge*, and makes the means of action the agent itself. Knowledge is the result of education; but knowledge cannot accuse, excuse, or condemn functions which conscience is represented as performing; nor will it in any place in which the word

occurs, make sense if substituted as a synonym or a definition. It would be incorrect to say that the eye is created by the power of light, because light is absolutely necessary to vision; and it is equally so to say that conscience is literally the creature of education; for as the eye may, and does exist before it is brought under the influence of light, although it cannot be exercised without it, so conscience may exist in a state of inaction before and without education; and as the faculty of seeing may cease to be exercised either from inability or design, after the eyes have been long accustomed to light; so it is well known, conscience may cease to act after men have long enjoyed, and while they are still enjoying, the advantages of education. Those who hold this view of conscience are accustomed, in accordance with it, to consider its decisions as uncertain and unworthy of regard.

The second hypothesis supposes conscience to be nothing else than the Spirit of God himself; for the secret monitions or warnings which they imagine to come directly from the Spirit of God, cannot be considered as forming the conscience itself, but are only the judgments or decisions of conscience. The notion that conscience is the Spirit of God, would seem to have originated in the circumstance that it is not under the control of the will; so that when people have found themselves suddenly and evidently condemned by their own hearts, in defiance of all their endeavors to pacify conscience, and avoid its reproofs, they have concluded that a monitor so prompt, so pure and unbiassed, and so little under their control, must certainly proceed immediately from heaven. Such persons accordingly are accustomed to pay the greatest regard to the dictates of conscience. They imagine it to be the voice of divine inspiration, and go so far in their vain confidence that even when the plainest truths and duties inculcated in the scriptures, of whose divine origin we are perfectly assured, are laid before them, they refuse to pay the least attention to them, unless, forsooth, conscience shall dictate the same!*

The falsity, however, of this hypothesis is manifest; since all men possess consciences, even the heathen, and the most wicked persons in society; and we know that the people of God alone possess the Holy Spirit, it being expressly declared by the Lord Jesus that the world could not receive the Spirit. And its absurdity is no less evident when we consider that the consciences of different persons impel to, or justify actions wholly different in their nature, directly opposed to each other, and frequently of the most flagitious, cruel, or depraved character. Thus the aborigines of our own country, as well as the ancient Spartans, have esteemed it *honorable* to steal; and the natives of New Holland make it a duty that if a woman die while suckling an infant, the child shall be *buried alive* in its mother's grave! Further, it is susceptible of proof that some of the inferior animals possess consciences as well as man. The noble elephant has often displayed

*If the monitions of conscience were indeed the warnings and teachings of the Holy Spirit, why should they be contrary to the dictations of the Holy Spirit in the Scriptures? Why should they not be precisely the same?

every mark of self-condemnation when he had injured his master or disobeyed his commands; and I have frequently seen the Spanish pointer, when he had, through too great eagerness or carelessness, sprung the game, return to the sportsman, with drooping ears and tail, and exhibiting every sign of self-abasement and condemnation.—Conscience, then, is not the Holy Spirit, and neither proceeds directly from heaven, nor is originated by the power of education.

Is it, then, a correct hypothesis that it is found among the original furniture of the mind? Such an inquiry would seem to involve the necessity of a minute examination of the powers and attributes of mind, as well as its mysterious essence, and lead us at once into the unfathomed depths of metaphysical obscurity. But such an investigation would be both unnecessary and unprofitable. Unnecessary, because the greatest geniuses which the world has ever seen, have already devoted their lives to such pursuits, and have in succession directed the views of men by their ingenious theories of mind and morals: and unprofitable, because after all their labor, they have neither attained the object of their pursuit, nor come to an agreement among themselves; but, on the contrary, have advocated the most contradictory sentiments, and advanced the most palpable absurdities. It would be vain, then, for us to philosophise with Aristotle, Zeno, or Epicurus, upon the nature of virtue and human happiness; to treat of "innate ideas" with Des Cartes; to descant upon the "hypothesis of common sense" with Reid or Stewart; upon "instinctive impulses" with Beattie; or "moral emotions" with Brown. Their various and contradictory theories are calculated only to confuse the mind, by exhibiting the difficulties and uncertainties which attend such remote inquiries, for the feeble lamp of philosophy cannot in these deep and obscure recesses guide us to certainty and truth—it only serves to render "darkness visible."

It will be far more wise and profitable, therefore, to be content with the plain definition of *conscience* with which we are already furnished, and the origin which it implies. For if conscience be "nothing more," as Mr. Locke says, "than the power of judging of the moral rectitude or pravity of our own actions"—the power of *self-judgment*, it is evident that it is only a peculiar exercise or application of the faculty of judgment, and that we might with as much propriety inquire the origin of the power of memory, perception, or imagination, as that of conscience. That it is the power of judgment exercised upon ourselves, must be evident to every understanding; for it is governed by the same laws, and influenced by the same circumstances as our judgment of others. If they who imagine that because conscience is free from the control of the will, it must therefore be a special divine impulse, would reflect for a moment, they would perceive that our judgment of other persons or things is not less free from the control of the will than our judgment of ourselves. We cannot help believing the criminal guilty, howsoever desirous we are that he should be found innocent, when testimony that is wholly irrefragable is laid before us, and we examine that testimony; nor could

we compel our judgment to admit that an article which we had just ascertained to weigh a pound, nevertheless weighed only an ounce. This would be quite impossible; and it is manifest that we are no sooner provided with a standard by which to judge, than we are unavoidably compelled to justify or condemn either ourselves or others, according as our own or their conduct and motives correspond with this standard; and that our judgment of ourselves or our conscience will vary according to our knowledge of ourselves, and the correctness of the standard we employ. Hence by an easy figure conscience is called *weak*, when, from imperfect knowledge, it is wavering and unsettled, unable *prospectively* to form a ready decision upon the lawfulness of certain acts, which, if the person be emboldened by temptation or example to commit, it afterwards adjudges to be wrong, and therefore said to be *defiled*, or to *become evil;* in which expressions as well as their opposites, a *good* conscience, a *clear* or *clean* conscience, self-judgment is figuratively considered as a tablet, either fair and unspotted, or blotted and defaced, according as judgment is entered either for or against the accused. And these expressions are used with the greatest propriety, since conscience not only judges, but affords itself the only criterion by which the purity of the heart can be ascertained. Thus the conscience is said "to be purged from a sense of *dead works*," and the heart is said "to be sprinkled from an evil conscience;" that is, the unfavorable decisions of self-judgment are erased, and the heart becomes clean; as the children of the first covenant, when they had become unclean or contracted ceremonial pollution from any cause, as the touching of *dead bodies*, became outwardly sanctified or purified by the sprinkling of the blood of the appointed sacrifice upon their persons.

Upon the whole, then, the power of self-judgment would seem to be coetaneous with the faculties of imagination, memory, and perception, and to originate in what has usually been called the faculty of judgment. It exists, therefore, before education—before knowledge—even before the standard by which it judges; for it is obvious that it must first judge the standard itself by which its future decisions are to be regulated. So soon, then, as the mind is presented with *principles* upon which a standard can be erected, so soon does conscience begin to exercise its powers; and, like the faculty in which it originates or of which it forms a part, and those of perception, memory, or imagination, it may be modified and developed, improved and strengthened by culture and education. ALUMNUS.

Mystic Preachers nullify the Oracles.

——AND yet, while I will continue so long as I live to oppose this scarfing up of the glory of the everlasting Word, I will do justice to the motive which moves the evangelical preachers to this unwary and most ruinous procedure. They think that they secure to God the entire glory of the conversion of all men out of darkness into

light, by stripping the word of God of all intrinsic efficacy. Now, sooner than divide the glory between God and another, might the tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth! But what, do they mean to say, that the word of God is not a power of God, or that the glory given to the Word is abstracted from himself? The word of God I hold to be the sum total of all the world knows of God. It is his picture, his procedure, his mind, his will, his truth. It is the annals of our creation, our providence, our redemption. It his book of arguments, his book of persuasions, his book of promises. The knowledge which is in it, is the food of the new man; the acts of divine love which are in it, are the consolation of the new man; the assurances of divine aid which are in it, are his strength and his consolation. And they are guilty of the most daring profanation who would take the glory from the Word wherever they may please to bestow it. They that shut it either by force of power or by force of persuasion, or by force of a refined theology, against any mortal, do make themselves obnoxious to the first and last imprecations of the New Testament, and ten thousand denunciations of the Old. But do I, in thus giving a seat of highest honor and most powerful authority to the word of God, abstract honor and influence from God himself, or the Spirit of God? God forbid! Every truth in the revealed Word is a treasure sent from God to a needy world, for the want of which that world would fare the worse; and whatever benefits it doth impart, are to be ascribed to God as simply as if they had been imparted at first hand, and visibly from heaven. God knowing human nature, that it was a fine intellectual, moral structure, capable of being moved by ethereal and lofty truth, and of being won over to right by argument and affection rather than tyrannic force, hath, out of a high respect, and a wise accommodation to our faculties, presented in his Word such aliment as the soul of man rejoiceth in. For the soul, like the body, hath its wise and intricate structure, and that knowledge which it taketh in, like the food which we eat, setteth on work a thousand organs, which, healthily acted upon by the wholesome nourishment, do digest and transform the same, and bring forth strength, and beauty, and grace. And as to God, who sendeth food, we ascribe the glory of our bodily strength which that food refresheth and upholdeth, so to God who hath sent his Word to be the food of the divine life, we ought equally to ascribe the divine life which that word engenders and maintains. I do allow, at the same time, that as unwholesome food and irregular living do corrupt the body, and make all its organs sickly and diseased; so the use of this world's ungodly maxims, and the observance of their evil customs, as well as the natural corruption of the soul itself, have communicated various disorders and derangements to the framework of the spirit of man. And I am far from alleging that there is no necessity for a divine regeneration of human nature by the Spirit of God. On the office of the Spirit in building up spiritual life I shall immediately speak. My argument now is not against his operation, but in behalf of the operation of the Word. I do not wish to disparage the Spirit, but I will not have the Word disparaged as it is wont to be.

For the Word is the audible voice of the Spirit, his letter to us of remonstrance, of love, of entreaty; which neglecting, we shall have no closer, more inward admonition; which paying respect and giving heed to, as to a light that shineth in a dark place, the day shall dawn, and the day-star arise on our hearts.

Therefore, if those that are meditating to stand in the day of judgment, would prosper in their heart's desire, they must address their souls to the perusal of God's word, and meditate it with their whole hearts; believing all its representations of God's goodness, and justice, and truth; receiving all God's gifts of creation, and providence, and redemption, as an earnest of his further gifts of sanctification and everlasting life. They must not only read, but reflect; they must not only reflect, but they must discourse and entertain discourse upon it. They must not only receive it, but reject that which opposeth it, with all the habits which contravene it; in desiring and doing which, they should repose their trust upon God, and give praise to him, for they are reading, reflecting, and acting upon that which he bestowed. Their travelling with his word they ought to regard as a travelling with himself. If ever they detach the word from the mouth and heart of him that speaketh it, then it will become a snare to withdraw them from God; but if they keep in mind, that when it instructs, God instructs; when it entreats, God entreats; when it breathes tenderness, God breathes tenderness; when it offers, God offers; when it threatens, God threatens: then I declare before all wise and pious men, I see not what evil can accrue; I rather wonder that all good should not accrue from the greatest and the closest travelling with the word of God.

While the soul inheriteth in the word, dwelling and feeding thereon, it ought to inhere in the Spirit of God, with whose word it communeth; just as when you hear a man speak, you do not separate his words from the soul which utters them, unless you believe him a deceiver, which, if you believe God to be, I pray you to cast his word aside. For what are words? Words, if I may so speak, are a body to the soul; finer, more expressive, more varied than the fleshly body. By them she doth express her unseen emotions and passions to another soul, which, catching the meaning of the same, reacheth forth a kindred implement of being; they communicate with each other, they embrace each other, they rejoice in each other, they dwell in each other, they travel in company over spiritual and intellectual worlds by this airy vehicle of words. O! what a glorious invention is this of words! It makes the soul visible, tangible, impressible; enabling it to dwell in many places at once over the habitable earth; it preserveth the soul upon the earth long after the body is dead in the grave; yea, it breaketh the bond of death, and toucheth the clayey lips of the deceased with their wonted fires. We converse with them, we live with them, we call them from their spheres; they come, they tarry, not till the dawn of morning, or the crowing of morning's messenger, like the spirit of superstition; but they stay with us days, and nights, and forever; and we can gather a general assembly of

departed worthies, we can have them in our closets, they will instruct us, they will exhort us, they will make us merry; they will make us great and good, and teach us to fulfil the same good and noble offices to those who follow after us.

Such, even such, is the word of God; a link between the soul of man and the soul of God, a stage whereon heaven meeteth with earth to bless her needy children. The spirit of man there communeth and consorteth with the Spirit of God. The Spirit of God hath also taken the artificial body of words, and putteth forth his feelings to call forth the feelings of man; and the feelings of man come forth to the embodied feelings of the Spirit of God, even as they come forth to the embodied feelings of the spirit of man, because they are embodied after the same fashion and with equal favor: and so it cometh to pass, that communion with the Holy Spirit is engendered, and then the airy vehicle of words is nothing; but if the communion faileth, it must be resorted to again, as the only instrument given by Heaven unto men for that sanctifying office.

I——G.

Letters, &c. to A. Campbell.

WELLSBURG, *March 7th*, 1834.

Dear Sir,

I HAVE just received your reply to the part of my address to you which you have been kind enough to publish. I will say to you and your readers, that, being now engaged in moving my family into the lower part of the state of Ohio, I shall make no reply to what you have said until I have seen the whole of what you have to say. You call my production, "*common-place*," "*canting*," "*sectarian*," and intimate that it is destitute of *logic*, and suited to a *vitiated taste*—a *sceptical generation*. I shall decline submitting to your judgment, dear sir, or considering you as umpire in this matter, while I show the fallacy of your reasoning, unless you succeed better in future than I think you have done in your first reply.

That concatenation of *odious* epithets with which you have loaded my performance gives me no uneasiness; but the odious charact you have given to me personally, your impeachment of my motives confess has moved me to reflection. You charge me with *tact*, in holding up your pretensions to ridicule, and represent me as insincere when I reproved you for being uncharitable. You say, "That while you, for some *special purpose*, accuse me of uncharitableness, you *sincerely*, or *in heart*, regard me as possessing a degree of charity of a higher and more noble character, which is wholly unprecedented in the present generation." Now, friend Campbell, I do say that your exclusive pretensions as a *restorer* of the ancient gospel, I do consider a proper subject of ridicule; but I have no where said that you were a *hypocrite*. I *have*, and do now say, that I believe you sincere. If I have any where implicated your motives, as you have done mine, for

God's sake rebuke me for it—show me the passage, and I will sincerely make my confession to you, and to my God, and to yoor readers.

You intimate that I am so very uncharitable in relation to yourself, that "it would be easier for me to make a saint of Dr. Priestly or William Cobbett, than your humble servant." Where have I implicated your Christian character more than I have Luther's or Calvin's? And why, my dear sir, have you been so cruel to the virtuous and pious dead, as to couple the name of Dr. Priestly with that of William Cobbett? Never were there men more essentially different in character—Priestly's character is adorned with every virtue—famed for his useful discoveries—shedding light in every subject of science, (to use the words of Robert Hall;) while Cobbett is only known to the world in the character of Milton's devil—"making the worse appear the better part." Now, my dear sir, to show you how little I seek for sectarian praise, when it is not well founded, I declare to you and the world, that, notwithstanding I do not agree with Dr. Priestly on some points of Christian doctrine, I do consider him a saint in the Scripture sense of the word—a sincere believer in Christ; and it would be the highest ambition of my life to attain to the lofty eminence, in point of Christian character, which he, in my estimation, sustains; and, above all, to meet my last hour with the peace and Christian composure he did his. Even Horsley, his great antagonist, admitted the sincerity of his motives, and observes that "he will himself enjoy the "reflection, that by an equal sincerity through the power of that blood "which was shed equally for all, both parties may at last find equal "mercy. In the transport of this holy hope, he will anticipate that "glorious consummation when faith shall be absorbed in knowledge, "and the fire of controversy be forever quenched. When the same "generous zeal for God and truth, which too often, in this world of "folly and confusion, sets those at widest variance, whom the simili-"tude of virtuous feelings should the most unite—shall be the cement "of an indissoluble friendship; when the innumerable multitude of all "nations, kindreds, and people, (why should I not add of all sects and "parties?) assembled round the throne, shall, like the first Christians, "be of one soul and one mind, giving praise with one consent to Him "that sitteth on the throne, and to the Lamb that was slain to redeem "them by his blood."

You think it would have been "much more rational and edifying to have discussed some great principles of the Christian system," than to have addressed you on the subject of your uncharitableness. "What," you ask, "has my charity to do with the truth or falsehood of my views?" Perhaps I may fearlessly say it has a great deal to do with your success as a reformer, and your own personal salvation. If either of us are found supporting good principle at the expense of Christian charity, I say we are "as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal," and better for us and the cause of truth we had "*never been born.*" I agree with the great Locke, that to wound charity is a greater crime and a worse evil than to advance an error. According to my views of a reformation, the man who cultivates a Christian spirit—

who reforms the *morals* of christendom—who lessens the importance of those points of controversy about the mode of baptism, and forms of church government, &c. is doing the most essential service to the church of Christ.

But I must conclude by saying, that I would wish, above all things, in my correspondence with you, to avoid wounding your feelings. You know that I have not sought a controversy with you. My first communication to you (as you have acknowledged) was not designed for the "public eye;" and when I sent you my address on your uncharitable spirit, I requested our mutual friend to say to you, that if any part of it was calculated to wound your feelings, I would alter it, or suppress the publication altogether. What I think of your character as a private Christian, and my views of your defects as a *reformer*, will appear before we close. If I am vindicating a "sceptical latitudinarianism" and you the charity of the Bible, the reader must judge.

One word in relation to your remarks on our Editors for not publishing your reply to me. A young friend of mine in the ministry forwarded the first number of your correspondence and mine to our Editors for publication, with a request, as he told me, to publish both sides. He requested me when he left this country, to send on the numbers of the *Harbinger* to the Editors until the correspondence closed. When I found that but one side was published I ceased to forward the Harbinger. I hope this explanation will exonerate me.

If time and health permit, I shall finish my essay on a "Special Providence," and I shall, if agreeable to you, send you a closing number on "Converting Power and Spiritual Influence." In the mean time believe me, dear sir, your *sincere* friend,

J. A. WATERMAN.

Reply to Mr. Waterman.

Dear Sir,

THIS kind favor was received shortly after the appearance of the first part of your letter; but I could not consistently publish two letters from you at the same time, and have two collateral answers going forward in one number. Besides, you might have written a third in reply to my second, if, like the beginning of my reply to your first, it had been too strong for your nerves; and thus I should have been placed in the singular attitude of answering three letters at one time, with only a part of your first published. The example of Frederick the Great, of doing one thing at a time, would, then, have availed me nothing.

To proceed to the document before me, give me leave to say, that your *feelings* got the better of your good sense in imagining that I placed either your person or your production in an "odious" light. I said that you are above suspicion, as to your motives. I have already tendered my acknowledgments to you for awarding me the meed of sincerity, and a plenary exemption from hypocrisy. For all this I am thankful; for even this honor but few of the priesthood will allow me.

That you have a good deal of tact, I certainly opine; but that is no discredit to you. It is no *odious* attribute of character.

Your error (a simple mistake probably) concerning the spirit of my remarks on Priestley and Cobbett, similar to that noticed in my last concerning the Chief Justice, has imposed upon you an unnecessary task of vindicating Dr. Priestley from such an alliance. The design and point of my remark was, that your charity went to the two extremes of latitudinarianism—from Dr. Priestley to William Cobbett: not that I placed your virtuous friend Priestley and the far famed Cobbett on the same round of the ladder. No, indeed! There is, on every point of comparison, the breadth of the Indies between them. But pardon me if I violate your views of charity in saying that, I think, you place it above and beyond truth. You would, if I understand you, have more hope of a very charitable Cobbett than of a very uncharitable reformer, though he contended for every thing written by the Apostles.

You say that you "do consider my exclusive pretensions as a restorer of the ancient gospel a proper subject of ridicule." In this I must consider you to be sincere. But where are these *exclusive* pretensions of mine recorded? No where! The object of your ridicule is then a conceit! I do, indeed, contend for the restoration of the original gospel and order of things, and do think that no sect in christendom has the one or the other. In this I am as sincere as you can be. You yourself contend that except we find the ancient gospel and order of things exactly among the Methodists, they are no where else to be found. Are not, then, *your* pretensions a just subject of ridicule? I have only to show that you have neither the one nor the other; for I need not labor to show you that the Calvinists, Episcopalians, and Catholics have them not. I see a glorious revival reported in that great oracle of Methodism, "the *Christian Advocate*," of April 25th, New Jersey, signed by *James Smith.* Some fifty infants and twenty adults had been sprinkled under the labors of this James Smith.—Amongst the trophies of this revival was one whom Mr. Smith describes in the following words:—

"*One of these had been a member for* 20 *years, and a leader of a class for many years.*"

What a trophy! A class-leader, twenty years a good member of the Methodist church, converted to the faith of sprinkling—all the while in his own judgment an unbaptized Christian. Was he, or the class, which, for many years, he led, believers of the ancient gospel? and did he lead them in the paths of the "good old way"? What ancient gospel and order, then, have those Methodists who are immersed or sprinkled in order to induction into the church, or regeneration, as your Discipline has it!

Your gospel is not one, your order is not one, but manifold. Had the Apostles these varieties of gospels, baptisms, and arrangements? But I only drop a hint in passing.

Bishop Horsley places *sincerity* above faith and knowledge. His views of the heavenly state rise no higher than the state of the first

Christians. And surely, if these are his best conceptions of heaven, what value is there in his theory of sincerity? He might say as much of ten thousand Turks, Jews, or Deists, as he says of Dr. Priestley. And is this your model?!

I do, my friend Waterman, from the explanation you have given of your course towards the Editors of the *Christian Advocate*, fully exonerate you from any censure in my judgment for the manner in which they have treated me. Are they not one-sided gentlemen? Do they not need a little reformation, think you? What if Mr. Smith, of Burlington renown, should go and convert them to fair play and common justice! They need to be sprinkled with more purifying water than that of the Delaware. A revival in that office would be desirable.

Cherishing, as I do, a high respect for you, and sentiments of the purest benevolence, I need not add that it would afford me the highest pleasure to see you shake yourself from the dust of Methodism, and contend earnestly for Christian charity, holiness, and the faith once delivered to the saints.

Let me hear from you as soon as possible. All is now before the public which you have sent me. I will guaranty five subscribers for the *Christian Advocate* if they will publish the whole of your friendly controversy and mine.

Very respectfully,

EDITOR.

For the Millennial Harbinger.

Principles---not Men.

THE existing state of the religious community, at present, shows that men are set up as standards, to be looked at, admired, and imitated. In some places a man's piety is his letter of recommendation; in others, a superior knowledge of things human and divine gives men an ascendancy: but in almost every case men's persons are held in admiration. The Reformation itself is not clear from the above charge; and we may be asked how we can separate this influence, for it seems so natural for the rich to be looked up to, and the poor to have little or no influence. When the rich man speaks to us, we know that he is not moved by sinister motives; but even the eloquence of a poor man awakens in us a suspicion that he wants something. These feelings are so very natural, that we would like to be shown how we are to divest ourselves of them. Because those feelings are so *natural*, is the reason why they ought to be suspected. There is in the religious principles of Christianity a native force, and natural fitness, irrespective of the qualities or qualifications of the men who advocate its cause. We ought to act from principle in religious matters—not from those sordid and grovelling motives which actuate cowards and worldlings. All the evils which attend the religion of Jesus Christ are referrable to a neglect of the truth and a submission to the commandments of men. We must reform in these things; and as an antidote to

the evil I will suggest a few thoughts to the faithful, that their faith may not stand in the wisdom (nor folly) of men, but in the power of God.

When we attach ourselves to a man, his thoughts are our thoughts, and his movements become our movements, and wheresoever he goes we must follow. We must distinguish between men and their principles: for instance, a reforming preacher comes in our way, who is very eloquent: we are at once captivated with the man, and, instead of admiring the truth he defends, we hold his person in admiration. Thus does Satan entrap unwary souls. If a preacher does not fix our attention upon Jesus, and the things which belong to the kingdom of heaven, he does not do his duty. And how many fatal proofs have we, both in ancient and modern times, that when a man apostatizes, all his adherents go to pieces! Proof sufficient this that the people were united in the man, and were not grounded upon any rational, tangible principles; because if that had been the case, the principles would have remained unshaken, although all the men who advocated them had openly and forever abandoned them. As a still nearer trial, let me say to the reformers, suppose the main advocate, in your district, of your good cause, should disavow the religion of Jesus, and should contend that it was all a cheat; would you stand firm on your principles, or would you begin to totter and reel to and fro because you had lost your foundation? Every one can now judge whether he is fixed upon the eternal principles of truth, or on the man whose "breath is in his nostrils." Men ought to be esteemed for their good works, but they ought never to have that place in the mind which should be the receptacle of the truth. To come a little closer: Suppose the man who converted us to the truth, and convinced us of the principles of the gospel, should make war on those very principles, and with all his powers endeavor to overturn them, are we prepared to contend earnestly for *the faith*, even should it be against the man who first called our attention to it? If we can, we are built upon the foundation of the Holy Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone. This is just as it should be. And let us all have Christ in our hearts, reigning in and over us; let him be our guide and the object of our admiration; let his lessons of wisdom be treasured up in our memories, and we shall not be so easily led about by every wind of doctrine, nor be such an easy prey to the sleight and cunning craftiness of men who lie in wait to deceive.

A REFORMER.

Protracted Meeting in Baltimore.

BALTIMORE, April 29, 1834.

THERE has been a protracted meeting (of seven or eight days) held in the First Baptists' House of this city. Mr. *William Broaddus* was the principal leader, or preacher. Many of the friends of the reformation heard Mr. Broaddus with satisfaction, and were *almost*

constrained to say, "He is one of us." He was thought to preach in a similar tone, and to be equally as urgent upon sinners to come forward. But still there was a difficulty on many minds as to what they were invited up for. Report said they invited them up to be prayed for by God's *ministers;* and that if they could not come up personally, a letter expressing a desire to be prayed for, with a specification of the grievance felt, would be attended to. But as the wise man said, "The simple believeth every word, but the prudent man looketh well to his going," I thought I would hear for myself; and on Lord's day night I heard Mr. Broaddus preach from the parable of the Great Supper, [Luke xiv. 16—24.] He commenced by stating he had no connected plan to pursue in speaking from the parable, neither should he attempt an exposition of it; "but," said he, "I think it will be my plan to discuss some of the objections against the gospel." And this he did, not by obviating the objections of infidelity, but by exposing the weakness and futile nature of the excuses generally made for not obeying the gospel. He instructed his audience to exercise that plain common sense God had given them on the subject of religion; that it was an entire mistake to teach men that religion was a thing not to be examined in the common sense way; that there was not all the difficulty, generally supposed, about the truth; "if," said he, "the Lord had given his will in many books, all contradicting each other as the parties now do, then indeed there would be a difficulty—an insurmountable difficulty; but there is only *one* book which *pretends* to teach the way of salvation, and this book always speaks the same thing." He then exhorted them strongly to read that book—to read it through; and if any had done so, to read it again and again. As to what construction they ought to put upon it, he said God had spoken to every human being, and therefore they ought to exercise their own judgments upon it as they would upon any other matter. "For myself," continued he, "I would put a construction upon it which a man would who never had heard another express an opinion about it." He reprobated strongly a high-flown metaphysical way of preaching, and did indeed speak well and unassumingly.

But now that I have mentioned the excellent things he said, it is due to Peter, the first Christian preacher, to say, he seemed to have no taste for the kind of gospel preached on the day of Pentecost.—Now this neglect of Peter is too serious a matter to be easily forgotten by those who believe he was entrusted with the keys. To slight Peter and honor Calvin is a source of grief to all the disciples of Jesus.

When Mr. Broaddus had finished his discourse, another brother in the *callings and sendings* arose, and disburthened himself by assuring them, in pure Calvinian style, that if they did not come forward, and could not tell the reason why, (as friend B. had previously suggested) he would let them into the secret—"*It was because they had depraved hearts!!*" What a thought! and just in "the nick of time" too! for Mr. B. had laid the whole responsibility upon the people. He had, however, by the associations of his ideas, discovered that, in his views

of depravity, it was a reasonable excuse for them; and therefore, like a sly theologian, he made an attempt at *backing out*, by saying, that, "to have a depraved heart was a sin." He might as consistently have said, it was a sin for a man to have a nose on his face. "The legs of the *lame* are not equal."

When he had thus relieved himself *theologically*, he engaged in praying a preacher's prayer; and that you know is generally an indescribable mixture of big words and mysterious sentiments. I shall only give you the first sentence. You may judge from this of the rest:—"Holy Ghost, take of the things that are Christ's, and show them to this people!"

He had no sooner done than Mr. Broaddus was down among the people. He commenced pleading with them to come up and take their seats. He said, "The question is not now, Will you come and be baptized? That's another matter." Well, thought I, what is the question then? But he relieved me by telling them it was "Whether they would be on the Lord's side, or not"! After much zeal and pleading, one came up; and then he took courage. By and by another came forward, when almost forced into the reformation he said; and he wanted more to come, and "not only *come* and take their seats here, but *come* altogether, with their whole heart, and determine to obey the gospel. Poor Peter! thought I, what a pity you had not been any thing but a fisherman! O, Peter! if you had only been a Physician as Luke was, you might then have been introduced into this fine round house, and been permitted to tell those polite people what they must do! But, Peter, alas for your popularity! it would appear as if your fishing, or some other things, had given you a predilection for the *water*—and that is extremely unpopular. However, four came forward, and we left them *forward;* but what became of them we cannot tell. Whether Mr. Broaddus' *forward* is a kind of portico to his kingdom, I am unable to say; but one thought perplexed me much—and that was, that this man knows the right way, but will not walk in it for fear of being called a C——ite.

A LISTENER.

Religious Feelings and Impressions.

JAMESTOWN, *Ohio*, April 26, 1834.

Dear brother Campbell,

I DO not know that you set a very high estimate upon the experiences of men in religious matters; but as they are in repute in christendom, and are esteemed as the chief witness among men, of the truth or falsity of the professions made, I thought I would relate mine to you. I shall not, however, give you the full history of all the feelings and impressions that I experienced when a boy, nor shall I detail the circumstances that led to those feelings and impressions, nor speak of the times when, or places where they took place; suffice it to say, at an early age I became sceptical, but I have not room on

one sheet to tell you what it was that drove me into scepticism. After I became a man I was called a Deist because I spoke and wrote against the religion that was popular in the world. And from the contradictions in the religious world I was led to believe that God had made no revelations to man relative to religion. I concluded that the science of religion was similar to the science of medicine. That there were different theories, and the practice must correspond with the theory; and that God was not the author of those theories, for I never did believe God to be inconsistent. After I was convinced that God had made a revelation to man, (I have told you before how this happened,* therefore will not repeat it here, but hasten to mention how I examined the revelation of God to ascertain his will and my duty,) the first question to be decided by me was this: How am I to ascertain God's will? On this I had heard many theories, or various answers to the question. One said, 'Pray to God for the knowledge, and he will give it to you.' This threw me right back where I started—viz. that God had not revealed his will; for if he had revealed it, it would be absurd to ask him to reveal it again; and if every one obtained a knowledge of God's will in this way, he must be perpetually making revelations. And as to consulting commentators on his revealed will, there was no way of ascertaining it from them, for they disagreed about it. As to learning it from the pulpit, it was impossible; for those who professed to speak as they were moved by the Holy Spirit, differed exceedingly. I had already determined to try to do God's will as soon as I could ascertain it. About this time a man came along, (whom I have named before,†) and he told the people that God had made his will known in the Scriptures, and that he had said what he meant, and meant what he said. This seemed rational. But still there was a difficulty: I did not understand the languages in which God had spoken, and the same persons who had commented had also translated; and if they erred in comment, why not err in translation also? This difficulty was the hardest one I had to surmount. But after examining for some time (I need not tell you that I sometimes got up after I had gone to bed at night to investigate this matter, nor that my wife became uneasy lest I should "run crazy," as she expressed it,) I found that God had revealed his will by example as well as by precept; that he had not only given the theory, but had actually reduced it to practice in the person of his Son. Then by comparing the theory, as translated, with the practice, I could easily detect any error of importance. This was to me a pearl of great price. I thanked God that it was as easy to learn his will as it was to learn a mechanic art; for he had shown, as well as told, me what to do. I found that the first thing done by the great practitioner was to call on John to immerse him; next he told others what to do, and relieved sufferers wherever he found them. He mixed with all classes of people, and showed no partiality among them. He answered all questions put to him, and taught wherever he found people. He eat and drank with any who invited him, and

*By reading the Debate of Owen & Campbell. †Aylett Raines.

did not complain of the fare. He seemed to be careless whether he was applauded or censured. When applauded, he told them to give God the glory. When censured, he defended himself by proving that God never passed a law against the doing of good—no, not even on the Sabbath day. But I have almost lost sight of myself. I was telling my experience; however the balance is short. After learning God's will both from his theory and from his practice, (excuse medical terms,) I determined to engage in the doing of it to the best of my abilities. But at this time, having been nearly four years engaged, I find myself to be limited in knowledge of the theory, and a mere quack in the practice; but have no desire to abandon it, still hoping that I am, and shall be, in some degree useful to my fellow-beings, and that by perseverance I shall improve.

Yours as formerly,

M. WINANS.

Decree of Pope Lucius III. against Heretics.

A. D. 1181.

TO abolish the malignity of divers heresies which have lately sprung up in most parts of the world, it is but fitting that the power committed to *the church* should be awakened, that, by the concurring assistance of the imperial strength, both the insolence and mallaportness of the heretics in their false designs may be crushed, and the truth of Catholic simplicity, shining forth in the holy church, may demonstrate her pure and free from the execrableness of their false doctrines—

Wherefore, we, being supported by the presence and power of our most dear son Frederick, the most illustrious emperor of the Romans, always increaser of the empire; with the common advice and counsel of our brethren and other patriarchs, archbishops, and many princes, who, from several parts of the world, are met together—do set ourselves against these heretics, who have got *different names* from the several false doctrines they profess, by the sanction of this present general decree, and by our apostolical authority, according to the tenor of these presents, we condemn all manner of heresy, by what name soever it may be denominated.

More particularly, we declare all Catharists, Paterines; and those who call themselves "the Poor of Lyons;" the Passagines, Josephists, Arnoldists, to lie under a perpetual anathema. And because some, under a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof, as the Apostle saith, assume to themselves the authority of preaching; whereas the same Apostle saith, "How shall they preach except they be sent?" we therefore include under the same sentence of a perpetual anathema, all those, who, either being forbid or not *sent*, do notwithstanding presume to preach publicly or privately, without any authority received, either from the Apostolic See or from the Bishops of their respective diocesses; as also all those who are not afraid to hold or teach any opinions concerning the sacrament of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, baptism, the remission of sins, matrimony, or any other sacraments of the church, differing from what the Holy Church of Rome doth preach and observe. And generally all those whom the same Church of Rome, or the several Bishops in their diocesses, with the advice of their Clergy, or the Clergy themselves, in case of the See, with the advice (if need be) of *neighboring Bishops*, shall judge to be heretics. And we likewise declare all *entertainers* and *defenders* of the said heretics, and those that have showed *any favor* or given *countenance* to them, thereby strengthening them in their heresy, whether they be called

comforted, believers, or *perfect,* or with whatsoever superstitious name they disguise themselves, to be liable to the same sentence.

And though it sometimes happens that the severity of ecclesiastical discipline, necessary to the coercion of sin, is condemned by those who do not understand the virtue of it, we, notwithstanding, by these presents decree, that whosoever shall be notoriously convicted of these errors, if a clergyman, or one that endeavors to conceal himself under any religious order, he shall be immediately deprived of all prerogatives of the church orders; and as being divested of all office and benefice, he be delivered to the secular power to be punished according to demerit, unless immediately upon his being detected he voluntarily returns to the truth of the Catholic faith, and publicly abjures his errors at the discretion of the Bishop of the diocess, and makes suitable satisfaction. And for a layman who shall be found guilty, either publicly or privately, of any of the aforesaid crimes, unless by abjuring his heresy and making satisfaction, he immediately return to the *orthodox* faith, we decree him to be left to the sentence of the secular judge, to receive condign punishment according to the quality of the offence.

And as to those who are taken notice of by the church as suspected of heresy, unless, at the command of the Bishop, they give full evidence of their innocence, according to the decree of suspicion against them, and the quality of their persons, they shall all be liable to the same sentence. But those who, after having abjured their errors, or cleared upon examination, to their Bishop—if they be found to have relapsed into their abjured heresy, we decree, that, without any further hearing, they be forthwith delivered up to the secular power, and their goods confiscated to the use of the church.

And we further decree, that this excommunication in which our will is that all heretics be included, shall be repeated and be renewed by all patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops in all the chief festivals, and on any public solemnity, or upon any other occasion, to the glory of God and the putting a stop to all heretical pravity; ordering by our apostolic authority, that if any Bishop be found wanting or slow herein, he be suspended for three years from his episcopal dignity and administration.

Furthermore, with the counsel and advice of Bishops and intimation of the Emperor and Princess of the empire, we do add, that every Archbishop or Bishop, either in his own person, or by his Archdeacon, or by other honest and fit persons, shall once or twice in the year visit the parish in which it is reported that heretics dwell; and there cause two or three men of credit (if need be, the whole neighborhood) to swear, that if they know of any heretics there, or any that *frequent* private meetings, or that differ from the common conversation of mankind, either in life or manners, they will signify the same to the Bishop or Archdeacon. The Bishop also or Archdeacon shall summon before him the parties accused, who, unless they at their discretion, according to the custom of the country, do clear themselves of the guilt laid to their charge; or if, after having so cleared themselves, they relapse again to their former unbelief, they shall be punished at the Bishop's discretion. And if any of them, by a damnable superstition, shall refuse to swear, *that alone* shall suffice to convict them of being heretics, and liable to the punishment before mentioned.

We ordain further, that all Earls, Barons, Governors, and Consuls, of cities and other places, in pursuance of the commonition of the respective Archbishops and Bishops, shall promise upon oath, that, in all these particulars, whenever they are required so to do, they will powerfully and effectually assist the church against heretics and their accomplices; and endeavor faithfully, according to their office and power, to execute the ecclesiastical and imperial statutes concerning the matters herein mentioned.

But if any of them shall refuse to observe this, they shall be deprived of their honors and charges, and be rendered incapable of receiving others; and moreover, be involved in the sentence of excommunication and their goods be confiscated to the use of the church. And if any city shall refuse to yield obedience to these decretal constitutions, or that contrary to the episcopal

commonition, they shall neglect to punish opposers, we ordain the same to be *excluded from all commerce with other cities, and to be deprived of the episcopal dignity.*

We likewise decree that all *favorers* of heretics, as men stigmatized with perpetual infamy, shall be incapable of being attornies or *witnesses*, or of bearing any public office whatever. And as for those who are exempt from the law of diocesan jurisdiction, as being immediately under the jurisdiction of the Apostolic See; nevertheless, as to those constitutions against heretics, we will that they be subject to the judgment of the Archbishop and Bishops, and that in this case they yield obedience to them as to the delegates of the Apostolic See, the immunity of their privileges notwithstanding.

[For the sake of some *new* readers, though much has been said on this topic, we insert the following essays from a very intelligent brother in Tennessee. There is so much matter of fact, plainness, and point in them, we think they cannot fail to be useful to young disciples.]—*Editor M. H.*

Baptism for Remission.

PAUL, in his second epistle to the Corinthians, (chap. iii. 14, 15.) declares that a *vail* was upon the hearts of the children of Israel, in reading the Old Testament, or Old Institution, which remained untaken away towards the close of the Jewish economy; and afterwards on the hearts of them who believed not on the Lord Jesus Christ. Our Saviour told the Pharisees (Matt. xv. 6.) that by their *tradition* they had made the commandment of God of *none* effect. It is thus *now*, as regards the New Testament or Christian Institution, towards the close of the Christian economy under which we are placed. A *vail* in the reading this Institution has been over the hearts of Christians, and yet remains over the hearts of an immense majority; and by their *traditions* they have rendered the last enjoined and most important of the commandments or institutions (baptism) of the Lord, of this perfect, and complete, and most glorious institution, of *none* effect—by separating it from remission or forgiveness of sins, for which it was instituted and appointed. To *remove* this vail and to *destroy* these traditions, should be the constant, earnest, and incessant endeavor of every true disciple of the Lord Jesus.

The first mention which we have of baptism in the New Testament, is that of John the Harbinger. After his father Zechariah had his tongue loosened from the dumbness with which it had been bound, being filled with the Holy Spirit, he prophesied concerning his son, and said, (Luke i. 76, 77, 78, 79.) "And thou, child, shalt be called the Prophet of the Highest: for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord, to *prepare* his ways; to give *knowledge of salvation* unto his people, *by the remission of their sins*, through the tender MERCY of our God, whereby the day-spring from on high hath visited us, to give *light* to them that set in *darkness*, and *in the shadow of death*, to guide our feet into the *way of peace.*" And how was John to give this knowledge of salvation by the remission of sins? The Scripture is always its own best interpreter. What does Mark say? Chap. i. 4. "John did *baptize* in the wilderness, and preach the *baptism* of repentance *for the remission of sins.*" What does Luke say? Chap. iii. 3. "And he [John] came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the *baptism* of repentance *for the remission of sins.*" "In the mouth of *two* or three witnesses *every* word may be established." It was thus, by the *baptism* of repentance, that John gave the knowledge of salvation to the Jews by the remission of their sins. This fact no one of common sense can dispute or deny, without positively contradicting the plain meaning of Scripture. This was the reason, (remission of sins by repentance and baptism,) I believe, why

such multitudes of the Jews flocked to the baptism of John; and not to merely obey a command, without understanding its *meaning* or obtaining a benefit; and it was thus that he was (Luke i. 17.) "to make ready a people prepared for the Lord." It is unreasonable, in the highest degree, to suppose that they would have come to him from such distances, as many of them no doubt did, to be immersed by him, in obedience to what they believed to be a command, without understanding what that command was for, and the benefits which obedience to it would confer. Such conduct would be at war both with the purposes of God in his revelations to mankind, and the understanding of man to which these revelations are addressed.

The Lord Jesus, speaking unto the Jews concerning John, (Luke vii. 28, 29, 30) says, "For I say unto you, among those that are born of women, there is not a greater Prophet than John the Baptist; but he that is least in the kingdom of God is greater than he.* And all the people that heard him, [John] and the publicans, *justified* God, being *baptized* with the baptism of John. But the Pharisees and lawyers *rejected* the counsel of God against themselves, being *not baptized* of him." See here how intimately and inseparably *justification* and *baptism* are connected. They justified God because they had been baptized; which those who had not been, did not do, having, on that account, rejected his counsel against themselves. Thus much for the baptism of John.

REGENERATION IS TO BE NEW BORN, OR *BORN AGAIN.*

THIS definition will, I think, be given by every lexicon in every language, and be admitted as correct by every person of any intelligence. Let us hear how our Saviour explains this *new birth* to Nicodemus, (John iii. 3, 4, 5.) He tells him that "except a man be *born again* he *cannot* see [or discern] the kingdom [or reign] of God." Nicodemus inquires how can this be possible! Hear the Lord's explanation: "Except a man be *born* of *water* and the SPIRIT, he *cannot* enter into the kingdom of God." Was ever any declaration more plain and positive! This is the *true* Christian regeneration—this is to be new born, or *born again;* and who dare, in the face of such authority, deny that this is regeneration? This is the *only* door of entrance into God's kingdom in this world. There are but *two* kingdoms: the kingdom of God and the kingdom of the world; and he who is not in the *one* must be in the *other*, as there is but one division that separates them. He must be *born of water;* and to be born of water, he must be *buried* in, and come forth from the womb of waters. He must also be "*man*" before this new truth takes place; for our Saviour says, "Except a *man* be born again," &c. and none but such can be born of the *Spirit*. Observe the intimate and copulative connexion between "*water* and the Spirit." As the child may be born *without* life, so man may be born of *water, without* being born of the Spirit; but he cannot be born of the *Spirit* without or before the water, for the Lord puts water before Spirit, and both after "man." He may be quickened or begotten of the Spirit; but without *immersion*, he cannot be born again. But some, or many, will say that *baptism* is not meant here; and at the same time contend from the *same* scripture for the birth of the Spirit *alone*, as constituting regeneration in *their* sense of the terms. The best critics, I believe, both Paido and Anti-Paido, agree in saying that baptism is meant here; and how and for what else can it be explained? Let such objectors answer this question, before they attempt to prove such an assertion.

It was by *baptism* that the nations were to be discipled or made Christians, for Disciple of Christ and Christian are synonymous terms. Hear the last command of the Lord Jesus Christ to his disciples before his ascension. (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.) "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, *baptizing* them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; teaching them to

**If the kingdom was not set up until Pentecost, John could not have been in it, as he was beheaded before that time.*

observe *all* things [not a part] *whatsoever* I have commanded you; and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen." Here *three* things were commanded. The nations were first to be taught what the religion was, or in what it consisted—then those thus taught who believed were to be discipled by immersion—and the disciples thus made were to be instructed in *all* things whatsoever the Lord had commanded. Or as it reads in the Greek, "*Disciple* all nations, *immersing* them *into*," &c. That is, disciple them by immersion into the name, &c.; for the preposition *eis*, which generally means *into*, is here used; and before we can be *in* the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, we must be immersed *into* their names; as he who is *in* a house, or in a garden, or in a field, must first go *into* these places. Hence Christians are said (Rom. vi. 3. and Gal. iii. 27.) to have been baptized *into* Christ, and thus, in the last mentioned place, to have put him on, and thenceforwards as *in* him. The preposition *eis* is used in both these last quotations. "For ye [Galatians] are *all* the *children* of God by *faith* in Christ Jesus." How do we thus become God's children by *faith* in his Son? Let Paul answer the question, and give the reason: "For as many of you as have been *baptized into* Christ have *put on* Christ."

What was the last command enjoined by the Lord on his disciples before his ascension, as recorded by Mark? Mark xvi. 16. "Go ye into all the world, preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is *baptized* shall be *saved;* but he that believeth not shall be damned" [or condemned.] Here the condition of being saved is as positively and plainly expressed as can be. If one man were to employ another to go to a certain place and perform a piece of labor, for which he would reward him; and he were to go, but would not perform it, could he have any right to claim the reward? So with the sinner. He may believe, but if he wilfully do not obey, he cannot and ought not to expect a salvation from his sins, when baptism is made one of the conditions. He must not only believe, or have faith, but he must be *baptized* in order to be saved. Both are inseparably connected. Three things are expressed in this command. First, belief or faith—secondly, baptism or immersion—and thirdly, salvation or remission of sins. Each stands in its proper order; and no inversion or transposition can remove them. But some cavilling objectors, who catch at straws to support a drowning cause, say that because baptism is not named in the last clause of the sentence, it is therefore not essential, and unimportant. Our Saviour never used unnecessary or superfluous language. Hear him in another place. John iii. 18, 19. "He that *believeth not* is condemned *already*, because he has *not* believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God. And this is the condemnation, that *light* is come into the world, and men love *darkness* rather than light, because their deeds are evil." The unbeliever *stands condemned*, for unbelief is of itself a condemning principle. If baptism is not essential and important, why should the Lord Jesus enjoin the performing of it so particularly on his disciples in his last words; and in one place make it a condition of being *saved?* Peter attaches the same *saving* efficacy to this institution. After speaking of Noah with his family being saved by *faith* in God's promise and *obedience* in preparing the ark, (according to the *pattern* God gave him,) and taking refuge from the waters in it, he says, (1 Peter iii. 21. "The like figure whereunto, [or antitype] even *baptism*, doth also now *save* us, (not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer [in the Greek, demand or promise] of a *good* conscience towards God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Baptism must here *save* us from something:—from what? From our past sins and the state of condemnation in which they placed us, and thus from a *guilty* conscience. Let us hear what Peter told the Jews on Pentecost. Acts ii. 38. "Repent and be *baptized* every one of you in the *name* of Jesus Christ *for the remission of sins*, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." But, says an objector, they were to be baptized *because* their sins were remitted, or on account of their being forgiven! To repent is to be sorry for sin, and this term here is inseparably connected with baptize. It ought to be interpreted thus: Be *sorry* and be baptized *because* your sins *are*

remitted! What absurdity! Try Matthew xxvi. 28. by the same rule: For this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many, *because* their sins *are* remitted! And so with all similar passages. Thrown off of this horn of the dilemma, the objector lodges on another. He says that it is the sins of omission and disobedience in baptism, which are remitted here. Now how, in the name of common sense, could the Jews be guilty of such sins as these, or such omission as this, when they did not know that they must be baptized until Peter told them? And how could Paul be guilty of such, when he was as ignorant, until Annanias told him "to be baptized and *wash away* his sins"?

A REFORMER.

THE following intelligence from Harwood is of importance to those who are diligent students of the New Testament.—*Ed.*

A Table,

Exhibiting the important events in profane history during the life of Christ.

Anno Domini.

1 A plot of Antipater against his father Herod is discovered.
2 Antipater is convicted before Quintilius Varus, and put to death.
3 Herod dies. Archelaus succeeds him in the government of Judea.
4 This year begins the Christian era.
5 Caius Cesar, grand-son of Augustus, passes through Jerusalem to march against the Armenians.
7 Tiberius is recalled from Rhodes, and returns to Rome.
8 Caius Cesar dies after his return from Armenia.
9 Augustus, on the death of his two-grandsons, adopts Tiberius.
10 Archelaus is accused before Augustus for his mal-administration. He is banished to Lions in Gaul. Coponius is made Procurator of Judea.
15 Marcus Ambivius is made Procurator of Judea. Salome, the sister of Herod, dies.
17 Tiberius is admitted into the government with Augustus.
18 Annius Rufus is made Procurator of Judea.
19 Augustus Cesar dies. Tiberius succeeds him.
20 Valerius Gratus is made Procurator of Judea.
22 Germanicus, the adopted son of Tiberius, is sent to quell disturbances in the East.
23 Germanicus reduces Cappadocia and Comagene into the form of Roman provinces.
24 Germanicus is poisoned at Antioch by Piso, President of Syria.
25 Piso being accused of this murder, killed himself.
28 Valerius Gratus removes Annas from being High Priest, and gives the office to Ismael, son of Fabas.
29 Eleazar, the son of Annas, is made High Priest.
30 Simon, the son of Camith, is made High Priest, in place of Eleazar. Caiphas succeeds him.
31 Pontius Pilate is made Procurator of Judea.
32 Herod puts to death John the Baptist.
34 Pontius Pilate condemns Jesus to be crucified.

Catholic Controversy---No. 5.

IN our last critique on this controversy it appeared that the infallibility of the Church of Rome is found only in a general council. This general council is defined as incomplete without the Pope's

concurrence. So that neither the Pope himself, nor the clergy themselves, superior and inferior, nor the laity themselves are by themselves infallible. But *the three nothings* added together make *one something*—or *the three fallibles* make *one infallible* tribunal!

A definition of a doctrine issuing from a general council is therefore always infallible, notwithstanding it may contradict a definition given by some former council! But here a question arises of no easy solution: Is this infallible definition of a doctrine to be examined by every one in the church? Ought it to be understood by every one in the church? If so, must it not be interpreted by every one for himself? And must not every one be infallible in the art of interpretation, else error may still possess the hearts of the community? Or will an infallible definition upon paper act like a charm upon the mind, and produce an infallible acquiescence in the judgment of all who read it? Vary this question, or partition it out as every one pleases, and it makes the infallible definition of a general council worth nothing; and may not every one as well become Protestant and interpret the Scripture for himself at first as at last!

The tendency of Popery is *to abolish thinking altogether*, and its best policy is to have few general councils, few definitions, and as much *Latin* as possible in its modes of worship: for unless men can be made to *think infallibly*, (that is, *as the council defines*,) thinking will always be attended with danger to the peace and prosperity of the church. If Catholics would always sleep without dreaming, great would be the peace and perfect the unity of the church! But thinking will always call for new councils and create new troubles. We do not say thinking upon religion only, but upon nature—upon society—upon any thing called science. Any sort of thinking is dangerous to Popery. Galileo, of Florence, born 1564, and died 1642, presumed to think upon *astronomy* and *mathematics;* and he happened to think like Copernicus the Prussian, who was born ninety-two years before him; and he thought as Pythagoras, born in Samos, about 590 years before Christ, that the sun was the centre of the system of nature, and that the earth was not only moved round it, but moved on its own axis also. But this thinking contrary to the infallible definitions of general councils, first startled the Jesuits in Rome when he published his first tract asserting the truth of the Copernican philosophy. They procured a citation which brought him before the Holy Office at Rome, 1615, when he was charged with *heresy* for maintaining two propositions—1st. "That the sun is the centre of the world, and immoveable by a local motion;" and, 2d. "That the earth is not the centre of the world, nor immoveable, but actually moves by a diurnal motion." These propositions were judged to be false in philosophy, contrary to the word of God, and heretical in point of faith. His works were burned in Rome, and himself confined to prison till the year 1634. Copernicus himself kept his written thoughts in his secretary for more than thirty years, apprehensive of danger from the novelty of his opinions. Importuned at length by his friends, he published his system, under the title of *De Revolutionibus Orbium*

Celestium, (the Revolution of the Celestial Orbs.) At the sight of the first copy of his works, he is said to have been seized with a violent effusion of blood, which put an end to his life, 1543. So dangerous is it to think where general councils are *infallible*, and where *inquisitions* in their absence so *infallibly* secure the thinkers from thinking so loud as to be heard by others.

The philosophy of Popery is therefore at variance with all other philosophy—with the whole constitution of nature—especially with the human constitution. Its best and strongest arguments ever have been the lightning and thunder of the Vatican, the racks, and wheels, and screws, and fires of the Inquisition. It is as contrary to reason as to religion. To make men think infallibly by infallible definitions is the perfection of folly. And to place virtue and vice in not thinking at all, or in thinking from necessity, by statute and penalty, is abhorrent to religion—all the world, but Roman Catholics, being judges.

Without comment we laid before our readers, in our last article, the reasonings of Messrs. Hughes and Breckinridge on *the commission*. The gentlemen are, perhaps, equally at fault in their views of this important document. Mr. Hughes argues for the commission as extending to all the Pope's of Rome—to all the Priesthood indeed—in *all nations* and *all days*, from the day it was first promulged. The limits of this charge to the Apostles are, according to Mr. Hughes, the boundaries of the universe and the consummation of time; yet, strange to tell, these successors of the Apostles are not infallible!—not even with Mr. Hughes!—For it requires a general council to make one infallible definition. "I defy you, reverend sir," said he to Mr. Breckinridge, "to detect error either in the premises or conclusion of this reasoning." He, however, detects the error himself; for he will not admit that a Pope can, of himself, give one infallible definition! Pretty successors of the Apostles! Could not the Apostles give infallible definitions? Mr. Hughes' official successors are no successors at all, himself being judge—in the very point too, in which we need most of all successors to decide controversies of faith. He cedes his whole territory in one concession; and Mr. Breckinridge, instead of taking possession of it, goes on to show what kind of successors he will have by virtue of the commission; but it puzzles me to find even an attribute of apostolic succession in all his definitions.

On this point, however, Mr. Breckinridge is considerably reformed since I first knew him; and if he would adhere to it, he has conceded to us *now* all that Mr. Hughes conceded to him. He now affirms that "the Apostles had no successors, endued with extraordinary powers of any kind." Well, now, Mr. Breckinridge, have they successors without extraordinary powers of any kind? And what kind of successors are they who want every thing necessary to the office of an Apostle!? Is not Mr. Hughes himself as much a successor of the Apostles as you are? He lived since they died: so do you. He contends for the dogmas of his church: so do you. He preaches his gospel, and teaches his ecclesiastical canons: so do you. You are the creature of a priesthood who claims succession from John Calvin,

(disclaiming, however, infallibility;) he is the creature of a priesthood claiming succession from Peter. Wherein do you excel? Not in official honors, descent, ordination, tradition.

Mr. Breckinridge, where are your "church officers to whom the keys of the kingdom of heaven are committed"? [West. Con. c. xxx.] Are not they a sort of wooden succession of the Apostles, acting under the commission, "Having power to retain and remit sins; to shut the kingdom against the impenitent; to open the kingdom to penitent sinners by the ministry of the gospel and by absolution from censure, as occasion may require"? Is not this the young St. Giles?

The only difference between you and Mr. Hughes in this capital point is *priority of title*. He says his church got these keys from Peter, and tells you that you had them attached to your girdle by act of Parliament, 1647. The keys were certainly very *rusty* when you got them, and it would be extremely hard to identify them. But, really, your pretensions are just as unfeasible as those of Mr. Hughes. You contend that they belong not to any one of your priesthood by himself; but to the *ministry* of the church. And although he fastens them to the belt of one old man at Rome, he will not have him apply them to the gates of heaven, but by order of a general council. Wherein do you excel?

Had Mr. Brackinridge understood the Christian religion as it is taught by the Apostles themselves, his triumph over his antagonist would have been easy and complete; but he loses as much in contending with a Catholic as his brethren have always lost in contending with the Sceptics on the authenticity of the Christian Record. The Roman Catholic Church and all her descendants, in arguing with the Sceptics, lose, either in whole or in part, the strongest argument in support of the certainty of the Christian facts and events—I mean, the argument drawn from commemorative institutions. With the Presbyterians and Romanists there is no commemorative institution of the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus. The Lord's supper has lost its significance as a commemorative institution in being converted into transubstantiation, consubstantiation, and a Presbyterian sacrament. The Lord's day is a Christian Sabbath, a substitute for a Jewish sanctification of the seventh part of time. And baptism, which is a burial and a resurrection, is converted into a Pagan lustration, a Jewish ablution, or Levitical sprinkling of holy water. Thus the three great arguments, drawn from three commemorative institutions, introduced at the time of the events which they celebrate and perpetuate ever since, (a species of evidence that has never been falsified in the records of all time) are, like three great pieces of artillery on the walls of Zion, spiked and silenced by the infatuation of those who claim to stand on her walls and to defend her towers from the missiles of her enemies.

Mr. Hughes has certainly pushed Mr. Breckinridge into the ditch on the subjects of "infant baptism," "the change of the Sabbath," and "the practice of the church on the pastoral relation." While the Catholic is unable to defend himself on "the commission," he adroitly

carries the war into Carthage, and buries his antagonist in the ruins of his own little citadel, erected out of the ruins of Papal Rome. Thus we see, at this period of the conflict, the Presbyterian covered with the dust and broken fragments of his demolished garrison, striving to raise his head above its ruins, exclaiming, 'I will defend myself better the next time!' and threatening to remove the candlestick of the Roman angel, if his life be spared, by the next discharge of his artillery.

It must be confessed he greatly annoys his antagonist, and his antagonist greatly annoys him; but had he erected his standard in Jerusalem, *the Mother of all Churches of Christ*, instead of Geneva, Mr. Hughes had not a gun in his fortress that could reach him by a hundred miles; whereas Mr. B. could have turned the whole twelve Apostles against him and his Vicar of Rome, and shattered him and his image of Peter to atoms, like a potter's vessel. His long succession of Vicars and commissioned Apostles would have fallen upon him and ground him to powder, fine as the dust of the summer threshing floor. But here Mr. Breckinridge, willing to save himself and his fellow-ambassadors, his commissioned legates from the skies, and his traditions, stolen like the ancient images from the house of his father, seeks to hide himself in Rachel's tent from the search of Laban.

No daughter of the Mystic City can defend herself against the upbraidings of this insolent Mother of Traditions. She knows her own property too well to be cheated by a new label, and she is not ashamed to challenge it in the hands of even her own child. She will expose her own offspring to the contempt of the world, rather than hazard her own pretensions to honesty, or jeopardize her rights to traffic wholesale in all the wares of the traditions of the elders. Mr. Breckinridge looks as simple and as clownish in the hands of Mr. Hughes on this occasion, as ever did a high pretender to honesty when caught with stolen goods in his possession. But, as usual, he pleads *Not Guilty;* and hopes that by a change of the *venue*, he may not have to pay more than the costs of prosecutions.

A successful assailant against the arrogant pretensions of the Romanists, must begin at Jerusalem, and neither at Rome nor Geneva. He must give the commission up to the Apostles, and abandon the title of Reverend Ambassador of Christ. He must be content with the appointments and commissions of a single congregation, and hold himself as the servant of the church—not as its head, nor as its master. He must give up all the traditions of the Mother of Abominations, and make *the Bible alone* the religion of Protestants. He must build the church upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, and abandon the idea of ordination by classic Presbytery, Episcopal Conclaves, Conferences, and Clerical Councils, and be content with the ordination of the seniors of a single congregation. He must never think of official grace hereditary in the lives of a distinct caste or class of men; but find in the New Testament alone all necessary authority for erecting a congregation in any wilderness or island, if Rome herself and all her Cathedrals, Cardinals, and Clergy

were engulphed in the Mediterranean. Thus qualified, and with the Oracles of God, like David with his sling and stone, he may ask, "Who is this uncircumcised Philistine that defies the armies of the living God?" and with equal success might bring the Philistine to the ground.

But there are other upbraidings of these sons of the church militant, which merit a few passing remarks. EDITOR.

---John's Baptism---

AN IMMERSION FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS.

SINCE the restoration of the ancient gospel, much has been said, and much written, on the subject of Christian immersion: and so plain has it been made, we think, that he who runs may read; and the reader, most dull of apprehension, provided truth alone be his object, cannot but understand it. Having read all that the scriptures say upon this subject, and much that has been published from the pens of its most able advocates, we have long been satisfied, that the immersion, proclaimed by Peter the Apostle, on the day of Pentecost, was the glad tidings, which all who then, and who subsequently entered the Christian kingdom obeyed. We understand Peter to say, "Be immersed for the remission of sins;" and we understand him to mean, just what he says. But still we find there are many who oppose, saying, "For the remission of sins," does not mean, *for* the remission of sins;—it was, perhaps, a *lapsus pennae* of Luke the historian, or a *lapsus linguae* of the Apostle; or, Peter only spoke to and for the Jews; or his words should be transposed, to make him say, "Repent for the remission of sins, and be baptized;" or, something else; or, *any thing* else, but what he does say and mean: "Be immersed every one of you," (whether Jews or proselytes,—of whatever nation or character,) "for the remission of sins." Much, however, as has been said and written upon this subject; and plain, as to all the candid readers of the scriptures, and of the Millennial Harbinger, it may have become; there is yet one subsidiary view, through which we have often looked at it, which, we recollect not to have seen any where presented, but in the scriptures: viz. *through the ministry of John.*

Who, then, was John? Under what dispensation was his ministry? For whom did he make subjects? and how?

John, the harbinger of Christ, was the first Baptist or baptizer—the first immerser, who immersed by divine authority. He was also the last of the Jewish Prophets, and came as near to the Christian kingdom, as Moses did to the land of Canaan. He prepared the way of the Lord—made for him a straight passage, and prepared a people for the reception of him. He preached, "Reform, for the Reign of Heaven approaches." "Then Jerusalem and all Judea, and all the country along the Jordan resorted to him, and were immersed by him in the Jordan confessing their sins." Why 'confessing their sins'? Because, John preached reformation and *immersion for the remission of sins.* In the Testimony of Matthew, John is made to say, "I indeed immerse you in water, into reformation." Mark says, "Thus came John immersing in the wilderness, and publishing the immersion of reformation for the remission of sins:" and Luke says, "He went through all the country along the Jordan, publishing the immersion of reformation for the remission of sins." Thus did John *prepare* a people for the Lord.

Mark this, reader, John the Immerser *immersed for the remission of sins!* A prerequisite in the subjects was reformation; and the state into which he introduced them was reformation: but no more prominence or importance is given to these, in the divine testimony, than to the *end* secured, viz. *the remission of sins.*

'We have been accustomed to look at Christian immersion,' we have said, 'through John's immersion.' We have looked at it thus: *John immersed for the remission of sins*; saying to the people, that they should believe in him that was to come after him; that is in Jesus. Very well. The people reformed, confessed their sins, confessed their faith also in the coming Messiah, and were immersed *for remission*. Now, if John's immersion to the proper subjects of it, secured all this; should not Christian immersion do as much?—If reformation, confession of sins, and faith in a Saviour to come, secured remission of sins in immersion, under the ministry of John; should not a like reformation, confession, and faith in the Messiah, after he had come, do the same under the Apostles' ministry?—To our mind, an affirmative answer is the only reasonable one, which, from the data before us, can be given to these questions.

Having, therefore, ascertained that with John's immersion, was connected remission of sins, we must expect the same with Christian immersion; otherwise, the people whom John prepared for the Lord, were better prepared, and more highly favored, than those who enjoy the Christian institution: but this cannot be admitted. This would contradict, "Whom the Son makes free is free indeed:" and it would make the least of John's disciples greater than the greatest in the kingdom of heaven: whereas, of John himself it is said, "The least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he."

We come, now, to the commission for Christian immersion. "Go," says the Lord and Master, "convert all the nations, immersing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. He who believes and is immersed shall be saved: but he who believes not, shall be condemned." Thus we have it as recorded by Matthew and Mark. Luke speaks *of* it, thus: —"And that reformation and the remission of sins should be proclaimed in his name, beginning at Jerusalem." At Jerusalem, on the day of Pentecost, this commission was first acted on. Jesus was first preached to be the Messiah and Son of God. The people believing the proclamation, were pierced to the heart, and said to Peter and the rest of the Apostles, 'Brethren, what shall we do?' The answer is at hand. "And Peter said to them, Reform, and be each of you immersed in the name of Jesus Christ in order to the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

It has turned out just as we expected. All the subjects of the kingdom of heaven, under the reign of Messiah, are alike prepared—are alike favored upon their entrance into it. The sins of all are blotted out forever. They were, and are, and ever shall be, till he comes again, 'sanctified and cleansed with a bath of water by the word;' and so presented to himself 'a glorious congregation, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but holy and without blemish.' F.

J. R. M'Call's Vindication.

THE following communication, on account of the good news it contains, is worthy of being read, independent of the writer's vindication of himself from the calumnies of Mr. Howel. It ought to be observed, however, that it is wholly unnecessary to rebuke such spirits. Enough has been said and written to show that our opposers are incorrigible, and that they can do us no harm. So many of them have been detected, exposed, and silenced, as to authorize us to pass them by without throwing them a bone or a stone. There is not one periodical belonging to the whole ranks of the opposition, which dare lay both sides before their readers; and what other victory or triumph could we ask? Our brethren are too sensitive on the subject of self-

defence—and we have been so. I think the time has come when this chapter should end. Sentiments, opinions, and doctrines may be exposed and refuted; but slanders, calumnies, and falsehoods from preachers and editors of religious journals ought to go free. I have almost resolved to grant them a general licence free from tax and from every responsibility. Gentlemen and Christians who may oppose our views are worthy of attention; but partizan preachers and editors, who deal only in aspersions and personalities ought to be exempt even from as much censure as the angel bestowed on Satan when contending for the dead body of Moses. Brethren, hereafter let them alone.

EDITOR.

CLAIBORNE COUNTY, *Miss.* April 16, 1834.

Brother Campbell,

I HAVE received the 3d number of the Harbinger for this year, and learn through a letter from brother Hall, that brother R. B. C. Howel, of the city of Norfolk, has commenced an abusive attack on him and myself, charging us with having acted under "hypocritical disguise" in our preaching in his borough. Brother Hall has answered for himself, and I proceed to answer for myself. How he could make such a charge in relation to me, I am very much at a loss to determine. He seems to rest the merits of it on a letter to you, written by me when in Frankfort, Ky. December 6th, 1832. I would request him to read it over again, and see if he can find such an acknowledgment. I never expected brother H. to be guilty of such gross misrepresentation. It is well known to the people in Virginia how I acted while in their state, and the hospitalities I received from them. When there, I had not embraced fully the principles of the Reformation, (so called,) owing to the difficulties which I could not fully understand; and they were baptism for the remission of sins, as taught in the Holy Oracles; and the operations of the Holy Spirit. Upon these two points I became fully satisfied about a year ago, while investigating the subject in Mississippi. Until then I invited persons to the mourners' seat, instead of taking on the yoke or government as Christ directs; and such a course I pursued while in Norfolk and in Virginia. Indeed, I thought that nothing could be done without it, having been raised up under brother Verdeman and some of his pupils in Kentucky. I embraced the same things without ever examining and asking, Where does God authorize such a course? In what chapter in the Bible shall I find the authority? With these views and feelings I travelled through Virginia, almost invariably taking a chapter and entering into the design of the writer, and urging the claims of the Bible on sinners to repent, and Christians to observe the law of Christ, and in conclusion calling on sinners to come forward to the mourners' bench, instead of saying as did Peter on the day of Pentecost.

In the spring of 1832 I visited Norfolk, and spent about six weeks in the city, during which time I spoke as above stated, about five times or more, weekly. A considerable number joined the church while I remained, some of whom (the greater part) were immersed by brother H. and I believe about ten were immersed by me. It appears that brother H. attributes the revival to his labors. It may be so; but I did not hear him preach once while there. He frequently exhorted after we came down on the floor. Moreover, it is well known by the congregation that he urged me much to stay as long as I did. We frequently conversed about the Reformation; and I always spoke in high terms of the piety and heavenly devotion of those who advocated it with whom I was acquainted, and that I had always been opposed to human creeds and systems.

After we had been speaking some three or four weeks, brother H. said to me on one occasion, 'Were he to pursue the course in speaking that I pursued,

his congregation would soon know as much as he did.' Then, said I, they will not be called on to pay the eight hundred dollars, or thereabouts, which you receive for preaching, annually.

I was frequently asked what C—ism was; and always told them I could not tell, as some say it is one thing, and some another. Three or four times I told some of the prominent members that what I preached was called C——ism. It was known to the preachers in the Baptist denomination in Virginia that I was friendly to the Reformation; and I was asked by one, Who ordained me. When I told him, "Well," said he, "they are full-blooded C——ites." Yes, said I, so their enemies call them.

I am induced to believe that had not brother H. treated you in the manner in which he did, he never would have dragged my name before the public, and poured forth upon my head such abuse as that contained in his letter about brother Hall and myself. His treatment to you while in Norfolk I think beneath the dignity of the gentleman or the Christian; and he must vent his spleen on others who have been the means of adding to his numbers.

There was at this time no division among the Associations in Virginia, but it was not long after that the Dover proceedings were carried into effect. I believe the church in Richmond had divided. I have now determined to listen to Christ and the Holy Twelve, and act as they acted, and direct me to act.

I by no means would do any one injustice, even an enemy, if I could; and I hope the Editor of the *Herald* at Richmond will do me the justice to publish the foregoing part of this communication, that my friends may have the opportunity of seeing the same. As he has published brother Howel's letter, I will expect him to publish mine; and should he not, if the Lord will, I hope to be able to visit Virginia once more; then I will have the opportunity of addressing the public on the subject.

The cause of reform is spreading through Mississippi. About four years ago there was scarcely any; now there are in fifteen or twenty counties several able proclaimers, among whom are Dr. Newland, brothers Matthews, Thompson, Calder, Hughes, Davis, and others. There are several organized congregations, and persons are obeying occasionally. Brother Matthews and myself have immersed about twenty since December. Opposition runs high here as in other places—the same spirit of opposition; but it is in vain to kick against the truth; for it is mighty and will prevail.

May the smiles of the Great King be on you! May you be abundantly successful in proclaiming the word of eternal life!

J. R. M'CALL.

Essays on the Style of the Living Oracles,

And Critical Dissertations on the Meaning of Difficult Phrases; with an Examination of the Allusions found in the Christian Books to Ancient Institutions, Manners, and Customs.

No. 2.

THE writers of every nation under heaven have at least two peculiarities which deserve our attention. They have a peculiarity which belongs to themselves as men—as strongly marked to the eye of discrimination as is the face, tone of voice, gait, or any other characteristic personality of man. They also have a peculiarity which belongs to their nation, language, age, or whatever constitutes country. Matthew and John, for example, were *Jews*. Now while these two writers are, to the most superficial observer, easily distinguished from

each other by their *personal* peculiarities, they are both as easily distinguished from any two contemporaneous Greek or Roman writers, by their *national* peculiarities, as they are from one another by their personal peculiarities.

Attention to both these is essential to an accurate knowledge of any human composition. It is just as essential to a perfect intelligence of what is written by the holy men of antiquity, who spoke and wrote as they were moved by the Holy Spirit. We observed in our last essay, that the inspiration of supernatural ideas in no instance changed the style of the speaker or writer. It requires, we apprehend, no farther proof. But I think it worthy to be stated with all possible emphasis, that the national peculiarity of the New Testament authors has not been suitably regarded. We often criticise and apply their writings as if they were Greek, Roman, or English authors. They were *Hebrews*. They have their Hebraistic peculiarities, and these are as peculiar as their national institutions were in contrast with those of any other nations of antiquity.

We may close our remarks on the phrase, "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Prophet," with an extract from Doctor Sykes, as quoted by Harwood on Isaiah vii. 10—17.

"The Evangelist, in citing this passage, (which, as appears by the context, concerned a child which was to be born *before* the land should be forsaken by Rezin and Pekah, who then invaded Judea, and over-ran it) only cited them as words of Isaiah remarkably agreeable to the miraculous birth of Jesus, and not as a prophecy of his birth. Matthew, observing the providential disposition of things, and seeing the surprising and extraordinary birth of the Messiah in so wonderful a manner, expressed it thus, '*All this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the Prophet:*' but yet he meant no more than an *accommodation* of the Prophet's words to the case in hand: or, as Bishop Kidder expresses himself, after a long examination of this difficulty in his *Demonstration of the Messias*, Part II. p. 310. 'Matthew applies *the Prophet's words to the wonderful birth of Jesus*.' The difficulty or objection against this intepretation, arises wholly from our unacquaintedness with the Jewish phraseology. The Evangelists were Hebrews, and wrote as other Hebrew writers did. They did not make a language of their own, nor use a phraseology peculiar to themselves, but did as other Hebrew writers did, and followed their method. To understand them, therefore, we are not to judge of the sense and meaning of the Evangelists, from the common and ordinary sounds of words among themselves; but we must enter into the Jewish phraseology, and see what the Jews meant by such and such expressions, and upon what principles *they* reasoned. Their ways of speaking and of quoting, which can be learnt from Jewish writers only, must be looked into; and how unnatural soever they may seem to us, yet we must be determined by them, and only by them. Now it is evident from numberless examples, that the Jewish way of writing is exactly agreeable to that of the Evangelists; and the masters of the synagogue applied passages of the

Old Testament in senses very remote from that of the original author. Every page of every Rabbi almost will supply us with instances of this kind: and as for the particular term, *fulfilled*, they very often meant no more by that, than the happening of a *similar* event, or an exact agreement, in particular circumstances, of latter things with former."

While we have the same author before us, we shall treat the reader to another extract on the person denominated

"THE PRINCE OF THE POWER OF THE AIR."

"The Apostle Paul, writing to the Ephesian Christians, thus describes the deplorable state of *heathenism*, out of which they had emerged: 'And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins: wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the *Prince of the Power of the Air*, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience.' But whom does the Apostle mean by *the Prince of the Power of the Air?* The *Devil*, to be sure, say all the *commentators*. Take a specimen of their annotations on the place. *The Prince of the Power of the Air. Satan*, says Zancheus, who is the sovereign of all those powers—this region was given him for his dominions before his rebellion, nor was it taken from him on account of it. Aerem, says Erasmus, *intelligit caliginosum nobis proximum, vel hanc infimam orbis partem, in qua sola regnat ille, non ut dominus, sed ut tyrannus, et non nisi vitio nostro potens.* Says the learned Mede, I believe with the Jews that the *devils* were not thrust into *hell*, but inhabit the *air*. The devils, says Zancheus again, dwell and tyrannize in the air, from whence they observe us, tempt us, invade us, raise storms, &c. There are many kinds of demons, says Grotius, *terrestrial* and *aerial;* the *terrestrial* suggest gross sensual desires; the *aerial*, pride, revenge, vain glory, idolatry. The *Prince of the Power of the Air* is the chieftain of all these *aerial* powers. In these words, says Mr. Locke, Paul points out the *devil*, the prince of the revolted part of the creation, and head of that kingdom which stood in opposition to, and was at war with the kingdom of Jesus Christ. Dr. Doddridge's explication of the place is full of shocking ideas. A course, says that *great* and *good* man, so detestably evil, that I may properly say of it, that it was just according to the desire, instigation, and will of *the Prince of the Power of the Air*, that wicked spirit who commands the legions of fallen angels, that by divine permission range in the air, and fly from place to place in pursuit of their pernicious purpose of corrupting and destroying mankind.' But this idea of the devil, as the prince and potentate of the immense dominions of the air, and the chieftain of all the ethereal expanse, is not once exhibited or intimated in *any other* passage of scripture. The scripture is so far from representing *Satan* as the god and governor of the *air*, that it constantly represents him in a *state of confinement* for his apostacy and rebellion against God, *reserved in chains under darkness against the judgment of the great day.* So that instead of expatiating in the boundless fields of air, and

shedding his woes upon *miserable* mortals, he and his accomplices are described by the Apostle Peter as precipitated into the Tartarean regions, bound in adamantine fetters, and to *continue* there in *custody* till the final judgment. Besides, the *heathens* are here represented by the Apostle, as *walking according to the course of this world, according to the Prince of the Power of the Air, the spirit that* NOW WORKETH *in the children of disobedience.* But the *heathens* never worshipped the *devil*—nor can it be supposed that *the children of disobedience*, or those of the *heathens*, who were determined to persist in their infidelity and rejection of the gospel, were actuated and instigated to this invincible obstinacy and stubbornness, by the *devil*, whose influence pervaded the air that surrounded them, who had immediate access to their minds, and who then *worked in* them, and at pleasure controlled and actuated them. I make no doubt, but by *the Prince of the Power of the Air*, the Apostle meant *Jupiter*, the supreme god of the heathens, whom both Greeks and Romans revered as the universal sovereign, and to whom all the Pagans addressed their profoundest adorations. All their writers describe him as *the Prince of the Power of the Air*, and as the supreme president of the *ethereal* region. At the original distribution of the universe, *Hades* was allotted to Pluto, the *Sea* to Neptune, the *Sky* to Jupiter. Paul was well acquainted with the Greek writers, and with the heathen worship and customs—he knew that *this* was the *usual* appellation of their supreme deity, and he seems here to apply it, by way of contempt, to that *imaginary being* the Ephesian Christians had *once* adored, and all the *heathens* now worshipped. And to render his meaning the more precise and determinate, he adds, that this spirit NOW worketh *in* the children of disobedience. The unbelieving *heathens* were inflexibly attached to the worship of this fictitious *divinity*, they were invincibly prejudiced in favor of the grand object of their reverence, which their forefathers for many series of ages, had religiously venerated; and such was their superstitious and sanguine devotedness to their *Jupiter*, that nothing could prevail with them to abandon his worship, and to alienate from him those honors their ancestors and themselves had ever devoutly paid him. The *classics* are replete with *instances*, where *this title*, here used by the Apostle, is applied to *Jupiter*.*

**Nephelegereta Zeus*, (*cloud-collecting Jupiter,*) occurs in almost every page of Homer. *Ethereal Jove* is a phrase found in Theocritus. Horace calls the cold air *the cold Jupiter—Manet sub Jove frigido venator.* Virgil and all the Latin poets who speak of nature, use Jupiter and the *air* as synonymous. So that Varro from Ennio gives the following definition: *Istic est is Jupiter quem Græci vocant aera*—(Jupiter is the same which the Greeks call *air.*)

Satan, however, the head of all opposition, the hierarch of all rebellion, the high-priest of all idolatry, may be regarded as the original cause of all the paganism on earth; and although contradistinguished from Jupiter, *the Prince of the Power of the Air*, was nevertheless the occasion of all the homage paid by the Gentiles to this fantastic divinity, the offspring of a deluded imagination.

EDITOR.

New Version Defended---No. 7.

THERE yet remain two specifications advanced by Mr. Smith in support of his allegata. Of these, the first, with his comment appended, is Titus ii. 13:—

"Titus ii. 13. Expecting the blessed hope, namely the appearing of the glory of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ."—*Macknight.*

"The glorious appearance of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ. *Doddridge.*

"Expecting the blessed hope, namely—the appearing of the glory of the great God, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ."—*A. Campbell.*

"The expression *the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ*, as found in our common version and in Macknight and Doddridge, may be read so as to apply to the Saviour alone, who is then termed *the great God*, or it may be understood to refer to the appearance of both the Father and the Son. Mr. Campbell, not satisfied to leave the passage even ambiguous, alters it so as to bear only the latter interpretation, and thus throws aside one of the strongest attestations to the essential Deity of Christ. We admit that the common version is susceptible of amendment, but it should be so as to *strengthen*, not weaken the force of this attestation. The words above quoted, "might with propriety be rendered," *Doddridge* says, "*our great God and Saviour*, though they are also susceptible of the other version.—Mr. Fleming, in support of this interpretation, observes that we never read in scripture of the *Father's* appearance." This rendering is conclusively established by Bishop Middleton, in his treatise on the Greek article—a work of the highest character and of standard excellence. "According to the principles already laid down," he says, "*it is impossible* to understand *Theou* (God) and *Soteros* (Saviour) otherwise than of one person."—"We learn from Mr. Wordsworth that *all antiquity* agreed in the proposed interpretation; and many of the passages which he has produced from the Fathers could not have been more direct and explicit if they had been forged with a view to the dispute." "In the annotations of the Assembly of Divines, 1651, it is observed on this passage, 'To the confutation and confusion of all that deny the Deity of Christ, the Apostle here calleth him not only God, but the great God.'" Mr. Campbell apparently is not willing that Arians and Unitarians should be visited with such "confutation and confusion," at least from this passage, and either from sympathy with them or some unexplained, *unnoticed* cause, alters again the translation which his learned authorities have made for him from the original Greek."

Adam Clarke, on Bishop Middleton's theory of the Greek *article* and the *copulative*, if I remember right, (for it is eighteen years since I read that work,) says, This clause literally translated is as follows: "And the appearing of the glory of the great God, even our Saviour Jesus Christ." This is in accordance with the disquisitions of Granville Sharp, the original discoverer of Mr. Smith's rule. Granville was reviewed by a Mr. Blunt, if I recollect right, for I read his work also some twenty years ago. Wordsworth, an Episcopalian Doctor, followed in the trace of Mr. Sharp, and Bishop Middleton consecrated and consummated the whole. I was much amused, and perhaps edified by the labors of these gentlemen; but the defenders of their system, like Mr. Smith, have created doubts of even the universality of Granville's rule, which I think I may quote with considerable accuracy from memory. "When two or more personal pronouns of the same gender, number, and case, are coupled together by the conjunc-

tion *kai*, having the article prefixed to the first, but not to the second, third, &c. those two or more nouns, whether substantive or adjective, denote one and the same person." Grant it; and let us take Adam Clarke's translation of the passage, and what is its meaning? Let us again read his translation: "And the appearing of the glory of the great God, even our Saviour Jesus Christ." This version, however, upsets the theory of Mr. Smith, Mr. Fleming, and the annotation of the Assembly of Divines; for it means, but one person who is the glory of the Father, or the brightness of his glory. "The appearing of the glory of the great God, even our Saviour Jesus Christ," is only equivalent to, 'Our Saviour Jesus Christ is the exhibition of the glory of God, or the brightness of the Father's glory.' This is not the first time that an over-anxious zeal defeats itself. According to Dr. Clarke, the great God does not appear at all, but only *the glory* of the great God, even our Saviour Jesus Christ. Perhaps he may be right; for Jesus is often said to come in the glory of his Father: but I am not examining the theology, but the philology of these Doctors. I must, however, censure the said good Dr. Clarke for not following out his rule in the same verse. For the similarity of construction and his rule of translating obliged him to read the verse thus: "Looking for that blessed hope, even the appearing of the glory of the great God, even our Saviour Jesus Christ."* But he simply asserts that "the blessed hope and the appearing of the glory are not the same thing."

It is enough for me that Mr. Smith finds no grammatical or literal impropriety in the New Version. It is exactly in conformity with all the long and well established rules of grammar. That same anonymous translator, of whom we spoke in our last essay, who preferred *God* to *Lord*, (Acts xx. 28.) is with us here; which shows how little proof there can be found for the allegata of Mr. Smith. And does not Mr. Smith know that the King's translators themselves set us the example, in various instances, of inserting the sign of the genitive, even in *apposition?* For example, the very same construction occurs 2 Peter i. 1. "Righteousness of God and of our Saviour Jesus Christ." Were they not Unitarians here? Would he prefer to read, 'The righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ'?!

The remaining "and only additional passage which we shall notice," says Mr. Smith, "is,—

"1 John v. 7. Farther, there are three who bear witness in heaven; the Father, the Word and the Holy Spirit, and these three are one."—*Macknight.*

"Omitted in the version of *A. Campbell.*

"Doddridge inserts this passage in brackets and remarks:—"I thought myself obliged to intimate such a remaining *doubt* at least concerning its authenticity as I have done by enclosing it within crotchets."

"Macknight quotes the proofs in favor of its authenticity and remarks, "These arguments appeared to Mill of such weight, that after balancing them

* I did, indeed, hesitate whether to prefer such a rendering of this passage as Dr. Clarke approbates. Had I gone for any system, rather than to give the English reader the opportunity of judging for himself as far as possible, it is more than probable I would have preferred *even* to *and* in this place.

against the opposite arguments, he gave it as his decided opinion, that in whatever manner this verse disappeared, it was undoubtedly in St. John's autograph and in some of the copies which were transcribed from it." Macknight remarks for himself, "Many modern critics, however, are of a different opinion; wherefore, instead of passing judgment on a matter which has been so much contested, I shall only observe: 1. That this verse, properly interpreted, instead of disturbing the sense of the verses with which it is joined, rather renders it more connected and complete, as shall be shown in the course of the notes. 2. That in verse 9, *the witness of God*, is supposed to have been before appealed to: *If we receive the witness of men the witness of God is greater.* And yet if verse 7 is excluded, the witness of God is no where mentioned by the Apostle," &c.

"We have quoted these remarks to show that both Doddride and Macknight approve the reading of our common version, although the former intimates a doubt on the subject, and the latter does not absolutely undertake to "pass judgment." It is however enough for our purpose, that the passage in question *is found in both their translations*, while it is dropped in that of Mr. Campbell, and dropped without an intimation to the reader that he has departed from his authorities."

Concerning this much disputed passage we have no idea of writing a hundred pages, though a hundred volumes would not contain all that has been written on it. Its warmest advocates for a place in the text concede too much: they concede that the majority of biblical critics now abandon it as spurious. Horne, vol. 4, p. 435. *All the Protestant reformers* either rejected it from the text or marked it doubtful; and all the editors of the English New Testament, during the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. while they admitted it into the text, marked it as doubtful. Martin Luther, in all the editions of his versions during his life time, rejected it from the text; and in the preface to his last edition besought all persons to abstain from any alterations in it; yet in thirty years after his death they interpolated it. Calvin always spoke doubtfully of it. It was in 1544 rejected from the text of Stephens' Latin version. It is rejected by Michaelis, Griesbach, and indeed by all the great critics, because, of *one hundred and thirteen Greek manuscripts* extant, but *one* has it. All the Greek Fathers omit it. The first place the verse appears in Greek, is in the translation of the Acts of the Lateran, 1215. The Latin Fathers never quote it, and it appears in no Latin version before the 10th century. Were these all Unitarians?!

Our readers now have both sides. Will Mr. Smith let his readers have both sides? On the decision of this question we shall have data to appreciate the moral worth of Mr. Smith. Will Editors who have republished Mr. Smith's accusations, have the honesty to republish our defence? Will they do their readers justice? Will they do me justice? Is there on earth greater injustice than to condemn without a hearing? Did not the Greeks and Romans, *Pagans* as they were, decree that no man should be condemned without a hearing? And will the Christian Scribes and Elders impeach, try, and condemn in the name of Jesus Christ, one whose whole life is devoted to the service of their acknowledged Lord and Master, without a hearing—without even the forms of justice and equity? Would they not as Scribes and Elders—as *men*, wish to be heard in their own defence?

and will they insult their own feelings and the Christian Lawgiver by virtually saying, 'All things that we would that men should do to us we will not do to them.' Gentlemen, is the common version of Matth. vii. 12. a true version? And is Jesus Christ right when he says, "*For this is the law and the prophets?*"

EDITOR.

The Gift of the Holy Spirit---No. 3.

EARNEST OF THE SPIRIT.

HAVING ascertained the scriptural import of the following words and phrases, "gift of the Holy Spirit," "spiritual gifts," "the Spirit by measure," "distributions of the Spirit," "demonstration of the Spirit," "manifestation of the Spirit"—we proceed to the examination of some other apostolic phrases relative to the same subject. The phrase "*earnest of the Spirit*" next deserves our attention.

If the reader has some preconceived system in his mind which he desires to see established by these examinations, I think it is probable he will be disappointed; for we are not seeking to establish any. We prosecute this inquiry as if we had never written nor spoken one word upon the subject. We are taking a new course of examination, and if it result as did our former inquiries by another process, it will be then confirmatory of the views already offered; just as if the working of a question by the Rule of Three should give the same result as already ascertained by the Rule of Practice, it establishes the certainty of the former solution; but if it should give a different result, then it must call for a reconsideration of the matter. The reader, then, if he do justice to himself, will place himself in the same circumstances as the writer, and, with the candor and docility of a student, open the Living Oracles, and ask, *What say the Scriptures?*

Arrabon, the word translated *earnest* in the phrase before us, found 2 Cor. i. 22. occurs only in two other passages, (viz. 2 Cor. v. 5. Eph. i. 14.) It is a *Hebrew* word adopted into the Greek language of the New Testament, as the word *baptism* is a Greek word adopted into the English New Testament. It is translated usually *pledge*, earnest. In the common and in the new version, this word is always rendered *earnest*. The ancient Hebrew and Phenician word is a commercial term, and indicates that part of the price of any article which was given in hand at the time of purchase. The goods were marked or sealed, and a sum in hand paid, when the purchase was made; hence the Hebrew verb from which it is derived signifies *to make sure*, or *to become surety*. It is found three times only in the translation of the Seventy, and always adopted as in the New Testament, from which writings doubtless the Apostles had it.

Before we attempt to ascertain the precise import of this phrase, there is a word which occurs in the same connexion with it, both in the the Epistles to the Corinthians and Ephesians, which must be dis

tinctly understood antecedent to a full intelligence of "*the earnest of the Spirit.*" It is the word *sealed.* "God," says Paul, "has *anointed* us Apostles"—"Christ establishes us, God anoints us, and has also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts." 2 Cor. i. 21, 22. And Ephesians i. 13, 14. speaking of the Ephesian converts in the second person, contrasted with the Jewish converts who before expected the Messiah, Paul says, "Having believed, you were sealed with the Spirit of the promise, the Holy Spirit," (the promised Spirit,) "who is the earnest of our inheritance, for the redemption of the purchase to the praise of his glory."

The reader now perceives the intimacy between God's anointing, sealing, and giving of the earnest of the Spirit, and feels the importance of understanding the terms *sealed*, *anointed*, as well as the term *earnest.* We shall therefore attend to them in order; and first, to the word *seal.*

Sphragis, (seal,) occurs in the New Testament sixteen times. Of these thirteen are in the Apocalypse; and always denote a public mark or external sign, such as the seal upon a letter. The instrument by which a visible mark or impression is made is literally *a seal.* This seal has an inscription upon it; and therefore we have the instrument, the inscription, and the impression made by it, all denominated "*seal.*" They are, however, all visible. The instrument, the inscription, and the impression on the wax or on the paper, are called *seals.* Metaphorically it denotes secrecy, and is so used in the Apocalypse. It also imports confirmation.

Let us now examine all the places in which it occurs. Rev. v. 5. "*Seven Seals*"—visible impressions or marks indicative of security and secrecy. It is found chap. v. 1, 2, 5, 9. and chap. vi. 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 12. viii. 1. eleven times in this sense: chap. vii. it denotes the instrument by which impressions are made; chap. viii. 1. and chap. ix. 4. the impression made on the forehead; 2 Tim. ii. 19. it seems to be used for the inscription on the seal; and Rom. iv. 11. it denotes a confirmatory mark. Circumcision was in the person of Abraham a seal or confirmation of the faith he had in uncircumcision. It is only found once more, 1 Cor. ix. 2. "For the seal of my apostleship you are in the Lord." The converted Corinthians were a confirmation of Paul's apostleship. From this comes the verb,

To seal, [*sphragizo,*] which occurs seventeen times. Ten of these are found in the Revelation in the sense above defined. Rev. vii. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. x. 4. xx. 3. xxii. 10. Matth. xxvii. 66. it is applied to the stone on the sepulchre. John vi. 27. God has sealed his Son, confirmed his mission by the Holy Spirit without measure. Rom. xv. 28. metaphorically, *to secure.* The remaining passages bear upon the subject directly, and are found Eph. i. 13. and iv. 30. in the sense applied to Jesus, John vi. 27. God sealed his Son by the manifestations of his Spirit. The Apostles were sealed as his ambassadors by the same Spirit; and the converts from among the Jews and Gentiles were also sealed as God's people by the manifestations of the same Spirit.

To give a ring with an inscription, or to give a seal, indicated in all ages of the world the conferring of an office. Pharoah gave Joseph a ring (Gen. xli. 42.) when he made him governor. A similar example is found Esther viii. 2. iii. 10. The Lord Chancellor of England, Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, Lord of the Privy Seal, and the Secretaries of State receive their office by the King's delivering to them the seals of their respective offices.

The seal of the Spirit was then a public sign, mark, or pledge that God had sent his Son—that Jesus had sent the Apostles; and on their converts it was a sign or pledge that God had received them as his people. Every "manifestation of the Spirit" was a confirmation of the mission of the Apostles, a seal of their apostleship. The spiritual gifts bestowed upon the converts by the hands of the Apostles, was a seal of the apostleship of the persons who conferred them, and it was also a pledge that God had received the persons sealed as his property.

Connected with *sealing* is the figure of *anointing:* for Kings, and Prophets, and Priests, on receiving their office, or on being sealed, were also anointed with oil. The pouring of oil upon the head was a literal anointing; but figuratively, the bestowing of the Holy Spirit, or some spiritual gifts, is the anointing spoken of in the New Testament. An examination of all the places where it is found makes this unquestionable. The word *chrio*, (to anoint,) is only found four times in the apostolic writings: Luke iv. 18. Acts iv. 27. x. 38. 2 Cor. i. 21. Heb. i. 9. It is four times applied to Jesus, and once only to the Apostles; and certainly alludes to "the gift of the Holy Spirit" in the ascertained sense of that phrase. Luke iv. 18. "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me," says Jesus, "because he has anointed me to preach the gospel." Acts iv. 27. "Against thy Holy Son Jesus, whom thou hast anointed." Acts x. 38. "How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth *with the Holy Spirit and with power.*" This explains the matter fully. Hebrews i. 9. "God has anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows"—[his other public servants.] The oil is the ointment or anointing, called the *chrisma*, found only in John's Letter, ii. 27.—the gift of the Spirit—"The anointing teaches you all things." The remaining passage is 2 Cor. i. 21. and is connected with the *seal* and the *earnest:* "God has anointed us, sealed us, and given the earnest of the spirit in our hearts." As "the Holy Spirit and power" are not two things, neither is the anointing and the seal. "God anointed and sealed us" (apostles) are not two distinct acts, but the same act presented under two figures.

Those who regard John the Baptist as pouring water upon the Messiah call that his anointing, or *christening;* and therefore those who sprinkle water upon the head of infants formerly called it *christening*, from the Greek word *chrisas*, which signifies anointing!

The oil, the pouring of the oil, and the head on which it was poured, are all external and visible. Hence the Holy Spirit descended on the head of the Messiah visibly, and sat upon the head of the Apostles in the resemblances of fiery tongues. Thus were Jesus and the Apostles anointed.

There is, however, a difference in meaning between the word anointing and the oil, and between the oil and its effects. Oil had sensible effects upon the person. Hence as the emblem of the gift of the Holy Spirit bestowed on Jesus, it is called "the oil of *gladness*." *Joy in the heart,* arising from consecration to the Lord, was the natural effect of this anointing. This joy in the heart is a prelude of the fulness of joy, *an earnest* of the inheritance. This brings us within sight of the meaning of the association of the anointing, the seal, and the earnest.

A seal and an earnest are not the same thing, though the same thing may be both a seal and an earnest. Anointing and sealing are not the same act, though the same act may be both an anointing and sealing. A sign and a seal are not the same thing; yet circumcision to Abraham was both a sign and a seal. There is this difference between a *seal* and an *earnest:* they are the same so far as assurance is concerned; but the seal assures of an inheritance without being any part of it: whereas an earnest assures us of an inheritance, and is a part of the inheritance itself. A seal may be a pledge to others, but an earnest is a pledge to ourselves.

The seal of the Holy Spirit, as explained by Paul, (Eph. i. 13.) is the earnest of the inheritance until the full possession of it. The seal may be upon the head, but the earnest is in the hand and in the heart. If the head be anointed, the whole person is perfumed with its graces. The oil poured on the head of Aaron descended in its perfumes and influences to the tuft of his robe. The heart was always filled with joy when the head was anointed. All the members of Christ's body are anointed with him, and all experience the joy of that unction in their hearts; and this to them is an earnest, an assurance of the fulness of joy. But to this subject we cannot do full justice till we have examined "*the fruits of the Spirit.*"

Thus far we have progressed—God anointed and sealed his Son and the Apostles by his Spirit, and sealed the converts made by their ministry as his people, by various manifestations of his Spirit; and these manifestations filled the heart with the fruits of God's Spirit, which constituted an earnest in their hearts of the full fruition of the heavenly inheritance.

The argument or assurance which the earnest of the Spirit in the saints gives, is thus expressed: "If the Spirit of him who raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in us, he who raised up Christ from the dead will make even our mortal bodies alive through his Spirit who dwells in us."

EDITOR.

Progress of Reform.

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

BATESVILLE, *Ark. Ter.* March 13, 1834.

I HAVE been praying and looking for such a reformation near thirty years, and likewise for a more intelligent translation of the New Testament. Now I flatter myself I have seen an answer to my desires and hopes.

The fundamental doctrines of the present reformation is beginning to be understood and adopted by the S. R. B. Association. I believe antichristian constitutions and creeds are at this time completely expunged from all our churches. All have agreed to return to the peaceful government of Jesus Christ. The true import of the blessed gospel, I trust, is gaining more particular attention. Faith, repentance, reformation, and baptism, united with a perseverance in holiness, I hope will be the happy consequence.

GEORGE GILL.

Troy, *Pa.* March 29, 1834.

AN account of the progress of reform is highly gratifying to me, and I am under many obligations to several proclaimers on both sides of the Alleganies for favors of this kind. I know of no other way of discharging such debts only by paying them in the same coin. We have had refreshing times in this region since the first of last August. I have since that time visited brother Mitchell and the disciples in Centre county, Pa. three times, and have been much pleased with the late efforts of the former to introduce the reformation into that county. Brother Mitchell is doing more good in that place than the united opposition of all the opposing sects can do hurt. If I mistake not, 45 have been added to the disciples within the bounds of his labors since my first visit. Within the same time 67 have been immersed in our county, and 1 believe 6 in Luzerne. I have quite recently been informed that ten Free-Will Baptists, among whom is one of their preachers, have declared in favor of the reformation in this county. Brother Champney, a Methodist preacher, who says he has "fought the disciples in every corner," has, within a few days, fallen before the "Sword of the Spirit," and declares he has now found what will convert the world. Success to the truth! Amen!

☞Among those who have recently obeyed in Canton, is an aged lady, who has been an honorable member of the Presbyterian church near 50 years. An admirable example for old Presbyterians!

S. E. SHEPARD.

Beaver Dam, *Va.* April 4, 1834.

SOME time ago I proposed to the church at Dover to break the loaf and partake of the cup whenever we met on the Lord's day. One of our old brethren opposed it, and said he could not commune with me at all, because the Dover Association had turned me out. I asked him if he could conscientiously commune with me if the Association had not interfered. He said he could. I then asked the brethren to say whether we should attend to the matter proposed. All present agreed they would. All the males were present except two. So we have gone on comfortably with the exception of the old brother named above, and his wife.

You remember I read you a notice that Elder Fife gave in the Herald, of a meeting held at Webster's; in which notice he said the church lamented their condition. I read said notice to the church, and asked if they had given him any cause to say so. They said they had given him no cause to say so. I wrote to him to know why he should have made the assertion. He has not satisfied me yet, and I fear he will not be able to do it, for I think he will not acknowledge his error and ask forgiveness as he ought to do. After ascertaining that the church had given him no cause to say what he did, I asked whether I should continue my labors as before. They replied they wished me to connue. I then proposed that we break the loaf and partake of the cup when we meet on the Lord's day as a part of our worship. To which all present agreed. There had been a previous appointment for a three days' meeting, to be attended by Fife and Jones. At the time appointed they came forward, and found how matters were continued. Their meeting only lasted two days—we could not tell why, unless it was that they could not effect a division, which is thought was the cause.

The church at Deep Run drew up some resolutions. After saying they had read certain extracts from the Harbinger, they pronounced them unscriptural, and required the members of the church to sign their names to the paper containing the resolutions; and all who refused they turned out of the church.

Knowing many of those brethren well, I proposed that they be constituted a church at Deep Run; and last Saturday and Lord's day was the time we met with brethren Ainsly, Hyde, and Glenn—constituted a church on Saturday of seventeen members, broke bread on Lord's day, and had a pleasant season. Not one of the opposers were there. More will, perhaps, join when we meet again. If the entire loss of confidence with the public in those who oppose reform will soon stop their opposition, I think they must soon stop.

I was in company last night with a Mr. Hendrick, a Presbyterian minister, who is laboring to establish that religion here. He said you had imposed on the community by saying you had given to the public Campbell, M'Knight, and Doddridge's translation of the New Testament—it was more your own translation than theirs—"indeed," said he, "it could not be said to be theirs at all, it was so much your own." Will you please say something in your next number upon that subject? Mr. Hendrick says he knows what he says to be true, and he is associating with your friends here, and surely he or you is mistaken. Those who oppose us who plead for the Lord and his Apostles in the church, always make the attempt by censuring you, and seem to think their cause triumphant if you can be condemned. My motto has been that the Father has spoken to us by the Prophets first—by his Son next—and lastly, by the Apostles; and if it could be made appear that you are even worse than you have been represented, that would not lessen the importance of the reformation plead for. It would still be important. There would only be a loss of one of its advocates.

MATTHEW WEBBER.

UNION COUNTY, *Ind* April 4, 1834.

BROTHER John O'Kane is employed, and is an efficient laborer amongst us. He has lately immersed five for remission. Other additions have been made by other brethren within the past and present season, and the great anxiety of all is, that you would come over and help us.

JACOB DUBOIS.

UNION COUNTY, *Ind.* April 4, 1834.

SEVEN have been immersed and added to the church at Silver Creek, where the Christian brethren and disciples have agreed to meet next Lord's day to break the loaf. Brother J. Smith, Carr, Voorhave, and myself to attend.

J. B. HAYWARD.

ERWINTON, Barnwell District, *S. C.* April 11, 1834.

IF it be possible for you to prevail on some able proclaimer of the gospel to come and take up his abode in this section, you will do great good to the cause. There is not a section probably in the United States where more priestcraft prevails than in this state. We have had a teacher with us several times of the reforming school, but his ability is not equal to the labor to be done. We want a man of sound scientific education, quick in perception, and forcible in argument. Such a one would do much good.

The ablest of our sectarian preachers have more manner than matter, and more influence than honesty. Some of those, even the ablest, acknowledge they address the passions rather than the judgment. We have many honest men amongst us who would freely see right if they could; but having been raised under false teaching and superstitious bigotry, they must be brought to their sight before they can see the shackles they are wearing. There are but three reformers by practice in our neighborhood—a Doctor of Medicine, his wife, and his sister-in-law—a wife whose husband goes for the cause.

I am not a professor, but I have always practised honesty and candor. I admire freedom in both religion and politics. The cause you plead is a good one, and the principles on which you build are correct.

Do try and send us a man of capacity.* We are able to support him, and not more so than willing. We are where we have been raised. We are known here. We only want the man. If you can obtain a teacher for us, you will direct him to Dr. Erwin, Cap. U. M. Robert or Gen. Erwin, Barnwell District, where he will find a home and a field to labor in.

JAMES D. ERWIN.

HILLSBOROUGH, *Ill.* April 11, 1834.

AS to the progress of reform in this section, I cannot say there is much doing. The Clergy here have much *zeal*, but *not according to knowledge*. One great cause of the small progress made in this country, is the want of able and zealous defenders of the apostolic faith.

I am the only person in this vicinity who has the New Translation. There are many pitiful objections urged against it. Some say you have falsely attributed the translation of a part to Philip Doddridge. I wish you would notice this charge, and plainly refute it.

I am informed that in some parts of this state rapid strides are making in releasing the people from the oppression of the priesthood. A lady a few days since expressed some astonishment at the progress of this heresy. "For," said she, "some old Methodists are joining the C————ites!" "Strange infatuation!" added she.

RICHARD O. WARRINER.

PARKERSBURG, Wood County, *Va.* April 17, 1834.

THE prospect in Nottingham, Harrison county, Va. is truly promising. Our congregation amounts to upwards of 40. Others are searching the Scriptures. We have a beautiful site selected for a meeting-house, which will go up (no preventing providence) this season. The disciples appear to be doing well. We meet with much opposition from the sects. Rev. Wallace, the organ of Presbyterianism in this section of country, not possessing the candor requisite to induce him to meet us in open and fair discussion, took an opportunity at a *night meeting* to misrepresent and traduce. The *pious* gentleman remarked, among other things with respect to baptism, that if he should fall from his horse into the creek, he should consider it good baptism!

ROBERT COOK.

HIRAM, *Ohio*, April 18, 1834.

WE have had a three days' meeting in Hiram, which commenced on the 12th of this month. The third day was to attend to the co-operation business. Proclaimers present besides our own, brethren Bentley, Williams, Hayden, Bosworth, Heartsel, Aliton, and Greene. Love, joy, and peace prevailed throughout the meeting, and there was much desire for the conversion of the world. Brethren Williams, Hayden, and Greene agreed to spend their whole time in preaching the word for one year or more, if life and health were spared. Brother Heartsel agreed to spend eight or nine months at least this year, and brother Aliton could not tell at present whether he would ride this year or not. There were only five immersed during the meeting. The prospect is, however, very flattering at present in this county; nineteen have been immersed in Shalersville in less than three months past, and five in Hudson.

J. R.

VINCENNES, *Ind.* April 19, 1834.

NEVER having seen any notice in the Harbinger of the little congregation of Christians which have sprung up in this place, I have concluded to send you a

*Will some such brother answer this Macedonian cry?—*Ed.*

brief account concerning them. A little less than one year since nine of us covenanted together to assemble in this place as a church, agreeing to take the Scriptures for our guide in all things. We have continued to meet since that time (with one or two exceptions) on the first day of the week to celebrate the death of our Lord Jesus Christ. The Lord has blessed and prospered us. From the insignificant number of nine, we have increased to the number of thirty-nine; and all these, with two exceptions, have been added by immersion.

This place is situated immediately on the great thoroughfare from Louisville to St. Louis, and it is presumed that proclaiming brothers frequently pass through and are not aware of the existence of a church here. Should any hereafter pass, we would be happy they would call on us, and, if convenient, preach. We are much in need of proclaimers in this section—perhaps more so than any where else. Brother Trimble is quite an eloquent and able preacher, but he cannot be every where, and he is the only one who devotes any great deal of time to the work of the ministry. He is indeed a host. I send you a communication respecting him, which you may publish if you judge proper. It may perhaps be gratifying to his friends to hear him spoken of in such high terms in a public newspaper by one who belongs not to his party.

IGNATIUS MATTINGLY.

GOSPORT, *Ind.* April 12, 1834.

THE cause of reformation is gaining ground in this section of country. The brethren are awaking up to their duty to aid in the conversion of the world. A general spirit of inquiry exists among the different congregations. I need not tell you that we are much opposed—"As for this sect, we know that every where it is spoken against." The Presbyterians and Methodists unite at their meetings, but afterwards dissatisfaction arises about who shall have the converts. The Regular Baptists are in no better condition: many are leaving their ranks, and coming out into the reformation, determined to be free. Some two or three months ago a clergyman of the Baptist denomination had a meeting near Crawfordsville, at which meeting some of the brethren were present. After the meeting was dismissed one of the brethren asked the preacher some questions, to which he answered in a very abrupt manner, telling him it was not the proper time to investigate these matters; and the brethren being treated with so much contempt, left the place and went home. A few days afterwards the preacher went to a magistrate to prosecute the brother who had so offended him by calling on him for a proof of his theory. These are the potent arguments of the Presbyterian merchants against truth: they shun investigation, and exhort their flocks not to hear any who are not orthodox; and if any one is independent enough to think and act for himself, censure and expulsion is the next argument.

J. M. M.

SUFFIELD, *Con.* April 28, 1834.

——FINDING no prospect of succeeding in obtaining further admission into the Sanctum Sanctorum, I made appointments in different parts of the town, have gained the ears, and turned the attention of many to the *Holy Oracles*. For this I am a heretic, a disorganizer, have stopped a revival, and done much mischief.

About twenty persons have come together on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, to keep the ordinances as they were delivered to us. Eight have been immersed into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, for the remission of sins. Truth is gaining influence over error and human tradition, which I think the clergy will never be able to efface.

My labors are not confined to this place; many listen to the old gospel in different places, whilst priests and deacons oppose with such arguments as, "I did not so learn Christ!"

NATHAN PORTER.

KINGSTON, Hopkins County, *Ky.* April 28, 1834.

I WAS at meeting on last Lord's day, at a new meeting house, which was the first meeting ever held in it, and there was a church constituted there of between twenty-five and thirty intelligent members.

MEREDITH MYERS.

FREDERICKSBURG, *Va.* April 1, 1834.

——THE Clerk proceeded to read the proceedings of a previous church meeting, in which brother Adams was deeply implicated. One charge against him was, that he fellowshipped the C———ites. He said he had not done it with any intention to hurt their feelings. If he had offended any of them he was sorry for it, and asked their pardon. He said he did not consider it left at his option whom he fellowshipped, and as proof referred to the words of the Saviour, viz. "Whosoever does the will of my Father, the same is my brother," &c. He appeared to be so good natured and kind, that I do believe if any plausible reason or scripture could have been produced to prove to him that it was his duty to take up such a cross, he would have done it without one murmuring word. But none was offered—nothing save the resolution against C—ism, to which they said he subscribed. He said he reserved the right to fellowship us when he joined, which I know to be a fact. Messrs. Montague and Battaile said they understood him to renounce C—ism, and that his confession before the secret council was so full, that he believed it brought tears from some of them, although he had feared till then, that some of the council never would be reconciled to him. He (Montague) said it was a great cross to him that there was one family

in this town, for which he had formed a particular regard from long acquaintance, and had the utmost confidence in their piety; but for the sake of consistency he had to take up the cross, disagreeable as it was. Our friend Taylor, from Richmond, arose and said, 'There could be no doubt but there were many pious good Christians among the C—ites; that in Richmond whole families had been led away by this error, and, party feeling; that he believed the doctrine was destructive to men's souls; and that those who held it were doing great injury to his Master's cause: that he was very sorry brother Adams had not been more consistent.

There being about thirty members who have manifested their unwillingness to remain under such regulations as the old churches have, by appiying for letters, &c. and who wish to retain the name of Regular Baptist, were aided by our friend Taylor, on Sunday before last, to constitute a place of refuge in Falmouth, for which purpose he had resorted hither; where it is expected that all those who are unwilling to remain in the Regular Baptist church, and have not independence of mind, nor love enough for the laws of Christ to adhere to them alone, will resort; for if they were willing to be governed by the laws of Christ, we had room, and were willing to receive all those who had rather obey God than men.

ABNER LEITCH.

LIVINGSTON, Bedford County, *Ten.* April 7, 1834.

THERE is within 12 miles of this place four congregations, to which I have been in the habit of preaching. They have taken the word of God alone, and are called Reformers. I think in all they number about 600. I think they do not break the loaf at any one of them every Lord's day; but seem to be moving a little forward, for all talk of doing it monthly, and they will mingle; so that many will, I think, be present every Lord's day. There are in the four about ten public speakers.

WILLIS HOPWOOD.

TUSCALOOSA COUNTY, *Ala.* March 5, 1834.

THREE or four years ago we expelled persons from Baptist congregations for holding or expressing the principles you advocate; but now these principles are gaining ground daily. The doctrines of Calvinism, creeds, abstract principles, associations, and disciplines, are losing credit very fast. There will, perhaps, in a few years be a great revolution in these churches. I live within a mile and a half of Salem, a Baptist church, containing more than one hundred members. At their last meeting the majority (the votes were 63 to 21) voted out of the church the abstract principles, written rules entirely, and resolved to take the New Testament for their standard of doctrine and church discipline hereafter. This church *has two Pastors*—both are on the reform side.

J. H. WALSH.

☞Will our friend Walsh give us a brief history of the progress of the gospel and the principles of the reformation in his part of Alabama?—*Ed.*

MERRITT'S TOWN, *Pa.* May 5, 1834.

HAVING nothing of a very interesting nature to write, but many good wishes for the progress of the reformation for which you plead, I therefore submit the following article.

Times here are after the fashion, pretty much as usual; persecution and opposition on the left hand and on the right; but still I am not dismayed. The world, the flesh, and the devil, these enemies to the true worship of God, cannot be overcome but by the word of God. John in his second epistle rejoiced greatly when he found some children of God walking in truth, and wrote, "As we received commandment from the Father. And now I beseech thee, Cyria, not as writing to thee a new commandment, but that which we had from the beginning—that we love one another. And this is the love—that we walk according to his commandments."

GEORGE B. CRAFT.

MONROE COUNTY, *Mo.* May 2, 1834.

IT is almost one year since I wrote you. The reformation is progressing more slowly than it did last year. Brother G. Waters and myself labored together for about eight days through this county, about the first of last August, in which time we immersed nineteen persons. I have immersed only two this spring. The Elk Fork Church received three members last meeting who had formerly belonged to the Baptists—others are expected. The church at Paris, which commenced with six members about thirteen months ago, has increased to upwards of seventy, and are growing in grace and the knowledge of God's word. There is much opposition here from the Methodist circuit riders.

We have five churches in this county that brother H. Thomas has to preach to as our evangelist, besides the one in Palmyra; so that our harvest is much too large for our laborer. We would be very glad to see brother John Smith, either of the brothers Creaths, or any other able brother, who would spend two or three months in advocating the New Testament as the all sufficient guide to heaven.

THOMAS THOMPSON.

CICERO, *N. Y.* May 2, 1834.

SINCE I wrote you last four more have been added to our congregation, making *forty-five* in all since the first of last January. We meet every first day, as the primitive disciples did, to break bread; and though we have no regular proclaimer, our meetings are very interesting. We read the Scriptures, make such observations upon them as may occur, propose and answer questions, exhort, sing, and pray. Our assemblies are large and attentive, and those who come to observe our order appear to be interested. We know what it is to have all manner of evil spoken against us falsely for Christ's sake; but this only makes us love one another the more.

The principles of the reformation are taking root in Oswego county. Brother Lowell has preached there a few times, and last first day he had the pleasure of immersing *six* for remission. Five of them were respectable members of the Presbyterian church—the other a Methodist. These are the first fruits of that county, and, we trust, the pledge of a plentiful harvest. Previous to the meeting at which the above candidates were immersed, the different sects convened, and having "the same day" been made friends, agreed to unite and try to prevent the spread of this

wicked heresy in that place. They admonished their several congregations not to go to hear us. But it was all to no purpose. The people manifested a determination to think and act for themselves. The kingdom of the clergy trembles. One of its members said a few days ago, he had no doubt but clerical authority must go down; for, said he, we read, "The witnesses must be slain"!

Many more are ready to become obedient to the faith in that place. An effectual door appears to be opened for proclaiming the truth; but we greatly need more laborers.

One year ago the most sanguine friend of the reformation could hardly have expected to see such a state of things as is now existing all through this country. The Lord be praised for his goodness to us.

H. JOSLIN.

COVINGTON, *Ten.* May 7, 1834.

ON the first Lord's day in this month brother Peyton Smith, (formerly of Middle Tennessee) agreeably to a former appointment, delivered a discourse in my dwelling house on the Christian Religion. To my gratification about twenty brethren and sisters had convened on the occasion, who had migrated from different sections of country to this vicinity. We had an interesting meeting; and after an appropriate address by brother Smith, a proposition was made that all the brethren and sisters present, who were desirous to keep the commandments and institutions of the Great King, make themselves known to one another by giving in their names, in manifestation of their willingness to unite with each other in the worship and order of the ancient congregations—taking the word of God as the infallible directory of Christians through this to the eternal world. Twenty came forward, having given themselves to the Lord, and now to each other. After which we broke the loaf in commemoration of our dying Lord. Joy and gladness seemed to pervade every breast. We ask your prayers, my brother, and the prayers of all the holy brethren. We expect some further additions when we meet again. May the Lord prosper his cause in this vicinity, through the vast valley of the Mississippi, and to the ends of the earth, until all opposing authority shall have been put down by the triumphant reign of the Prince of Peace!

J. W. JEFFREYS.

CINCINNATI, May 13, 1834.

THE Presbyterians here have held a protracted meeting of forty days. They have renewed, and are at this time continuing the same, as I suppose to the extent of forty days more. Mr. Hall, of Lexington, has been showing off in his best style. Meetings every night in the week. The mourning benches and anxious seats groan beneath the numbers which are continually crowded on them; tears shed, prayers made, and the heavens rent with songs, in order to excite the passions of the timid. The abode of the damned is opened from time to time, and all the anguish of the condemned pictured in the most glowing colors, for the purpose of frightening those who would not yield to their frequent and unreasonable requests. The excitement among the people is great; the efforts of the preachers unabated. But who can picture the reverse of this six months hence? When will men learn wisdom, and blind guides become enlightened?

GEORGE RICE.

VICTORY, *N. Y.* March 27, 1834.

ON Saturday, the 15th of February, a three days' meeting commenced in Cicero, Onondaga county, about 20 miles from my residence; another on Pompey Hill on Lord's day following; another the next Saturday in Ellisburg, Jefferson county; another in Ira, the town adjoining the one in which I live, on the next Thursday. During this time there were lectures delivered in other places contiguous to those above mentioned. The meetings resulted in the conversion of 59, as follows:—In Cicero, 13; in Pompey, 17; in Manlius, 2; in Jefferson, 12; in Ira, 12; in Victory, 3—some in every period of life, from the little girl of 9 years, to the old man of 63 years, have turned to the Lord. It was very affecting to see in Ira, after a faithful exhibition of the requirements of King Messiah, upon the invitation being given for willing souls to obey the Lord, two little girls arise, (one 9, the other 12,) bathed in tears, and desire to be introduced into the kingdom; while men and women, of mature age and judgment, and greater sinners too, (therefore the motives stronger, if possible, to urge them to the renewing bath,) sit in pensive silence on their seats. In the above we have a fair exhibition of the soul cheering truth—the gospel is adapted to us in our present condition. No tongue can express my joy in being delivered from the withering influence of the popular dogmas of this age. I can discover the adaptation of all the moral means employed by the God of heaven in bringing sinners back to himself. To that desirable end I neither ascend to heaven nor descend into the deep to obtain either the motives to induce, or the spirit to apply them, in order to get the sinner converted. The word is very nigh them, even in their mouth and in their heart—that is, the word of faith which the Apostles preached.

Since the date of the meeting above mentioned, brother Moss has immersed nine—five in Cicero; one in Syracuse, his natural sister; and three in Pompey, one a student of divinity, who has been three years in the Priest Factory at Auburn.

JOHN M. BARTLETT.

BROWNSVILLE, *West Tennessee*, May 12, 1834.

I ATTENDED at the water side a few days ago, near Waterloo, Lauderdale county, Alabama, to baptize two persons, spoke on that subject, and baptized six before I left the water. The prospect is very good at that place. On entering the western district of Tennessee, I find reformation rapidly progressing. I arrived in Brownsville last Friday evening. I addressed five discourses to small but attentive congregations. On Lord's day I spoke on immersion. After the people were dismissed, two of the most respectable and intelligent ladies of Brownsville, members of the Presbyterian church, came and demanded baptism. We retired to the water, and I immersed three. May heaven's kind King protect them!

ALLEN KENDRICK.

CARLOWSVILLE, *Ala.* May 13, 1834.

TRUTH is on the march, even in this southern *worldly* section. Some twelve or fourteen have been immersed within about a month in an adjoining county.

E. A. SMITH.

LOUISVILLE, *Ky.* May 21, 1834.

I HAVE spoken about thirty-one times in the course of three weeks and one day; during which time eighteen have made the good confession, and several others have been added. I passed through Charlestown, Indiana. Brother Cole, whom you know, resides there. The prospect in that region of country is good. In some neighborhoods I find great want of zeal and action; in some congregations perhaps not more than two or three can be persuaded to pray in the congregation, or deliver an address or exhortation. They can reason logically on points of controversy, talk fluently on the subject of politics or other matters pertaining to this world; but when called upon to pray, they "have no gift or talent." They say they are willing to meet the first day if some one can be had to do all the talking and praying. I think one cause of this state of things is this: Some of the proclaimers dwell too much, and frequently with too much severity on some of those subjects which are included in the phrase, "the present reformation." I am in favor of those subjects being well understood in every neighborhood, and the arguments fairly and fully presented; but for every speaker to be continually harping on them, while they are so ably set forth in our periodicals, I think is unprofitable. The minds of the brethren are drawn off too much from what we commonly call practical truths, or the beauties and blessings of the Christian system; and the consequence is, they have not the same energy and life that they would otherwise have, and consequently their talents are not called forth. Many brethren that might be useful proclaimers are doing nothing scarcely but talking about the sects—I mean brethren that have not spoken in public. I think they surely would, if they felt an anxiety for the salvation of sinners, exert themselves for the promotion of the cause. I wish you would say something on this subject. In some places almost all the brethren are active.

L. J. FLEMING, Jun.

VANDALIA, *Illinois*, May 20, 1834.

THE cause of reformation is making some progress in Illinois; and for the information of the friends of the cause I will state a few particulars concerning its advancement. I have recently became acquainted with Elder Bushrod Henry, from Virginia, who is a proclaimer of the ancient gospel, and has settled in Shelby county. Shortly after his arrival, which was in November, 1830, he commenced proclaiming the gospel in Shelbyville, the county seat of Shelby county, and in July following constituted a church with nine members; since which time the church has increased to nearly seventy. Also, in 1832, constituted another in Walker's settlement, with seven, numbering at present between forty and fifty; during which time one Calvinistic church was demolished, and its members joined the reformation. Arrangements are now being made to constitute two other churches in the same county. There are, perhaps, only two proclaimers of the original gospel in that county, who have to contend against all the combined efforts of the sects in that region.

On the 17th of the present month I constituted a congregation of disciples into a church, numbering fourteen, eleven of whom I immersed, a short time past for the remission of their sins, in Bond county, Illinois.

I am the only individual who proclaims the doctrines of the present reformation in a large scope of country around Vandalia. It may be truly said of Illinois, that "the harvest is great, but the laborers are few." Great efforts are making to make Presbyterianism the popular and prevailing religion of Illinois; but their object is greatly defeated, and their religion on the wane. The state is almost flooded with Yankee Priests, who do not suit the Western folks—consequently, do not answer the purpose for which they were sent.

S. P. GORIN.

A single Hint to the Disciples.

"I WOULD THOU WERT COLD OR HOT."

WE are a temporizing, vascillating, lukewarm race of Christians which are now upon the earth. In theory, fashionable Christianity is a compound of Judaism, Paganism, and Christianity. In practice, it is a compromise between Christ and Belial, the world and heaven. The policy of the first Christians was to secure heaven—this of the moderns, to secure heaven and earth. The philosophy of the ancient leaders was to keep up the fence around the plantation of grace, and to make the landmarks plain. The philosophy of our leaders is to throw down the fence, deface the landmarks, and to place the world in the church—to embrace *in the bosom of Christian charity*, every sincere Turk, Jew, Pagan, Infidel, Catholic, and Protestant in one charitable communion in the bonds of *honest endeavoring sincerity*. The difference between a good Deist and a sincere Christian is only an opinion; and where the kingdom of Satan ends and the kingdom of Christ begins, is as difficult of discovery, as Captain Symmes' opening into the nether spheres.

We brethren of the restoration want more decision of character—more of

the spirit of the approved ancients. A new costume, like that of Fox or Wesley, will soon wear out. I have seen but two Methodistic bonnets in a meeting of a hundred sisters, such as would have been regarded as orthodox forty years ago. Even the Quaker's hat throws a less shade over the shoulders of the Friends than it did in my own remembrance. It is also discovered that a few changes in the Grammar of Murray will not exorcise the evil passions which are found lurking behind *thee* and *thou*.

Many are the substitutes for *godliness*. But it never was, nor is, nor evermore shall be, substituted. No forms of dress, of speech, or modes of worship—no creeds, nor doctrines, nor formularies, nor rites will pass in heaven for *godliness*. Godliness is the heavenly science which the doctrine according to godliness teaches. The knowledge of God, and of his will, and of ourselves, are prerequisites, absolute and unconditional, in order to godliness. Faith, courage, knowledge, temperance, patience, are imperfect without godliness.

Who would not be godlike? A Pagan, accustomed to confer favors, and indisposed to receive any from his fellow-mortals, was asked the reason of his behaviour. "I will tell you, Sage," replied the Pagan Chief—"I wish to be like the gods, who bestow favors on all, and receive benefits from none." To be godlike won the admiration of a sensible Pagan. Need we any comment upon its nature, its excellencies, or its value in earth or heaven? Of godliness we have a perfect model in the religious character of the Messiah. Should we propose to ourselves a less perfect model! Let the disciple imitate his Teacher, and the servant his Master.

Brethren, a more untiring zeal and more unequivocal determination to stand perfect and complete in the knowledge and practice of the Master's will, are much wanting to our happiness and to our usefulness. Let us, then, be more decided, zealous, and diligent in the service of our Master in heaven, who, for the joy set before him, endured, and suffered, and practised the whole will of God. This is the way to honor—to happiness—to glory eternal at last. May the spirit of the ancient disciples animate the whole multitude who now profess their faith, and have resolved to follow their example! EDITOR.

Truth.

CHRISTIANS, hear what a Pagan philosopher says of Truth. Polybius, the Greek historian, was born two hundred years before Christ:—

"The greatest divinity, in my opinion, which nature ever discovered to mortals, is *Truth;* and she appears to be endowed with the greatest power. For notwithstanding all combine to overwhelm her, and every art and artifice are employed on the side of *error* to effect this conquest; yet I know not how it is, that, by her own native force, through all these difficulties, she makes her way into the human mind; and sometimes she *immediately* displays her omnipotence; sometimes after having been enveloped in darkness for a *long time*, she at last, by her essential energy, bursts forth, surmounts every opposition, and triumphs over *error*."———*Polybius.*

☞BROTHER H. GREW, bearing date April 1, 1834, informs that he "believes the nature of the Son of God to be truly divine."

☞MESSRS. HOWARD & GREEN.—Recent intelligence from Canada and some places in the United States, concerning these gentlemen, relative to their standing, as noticed some time since in the Harbinger, create strong suspicions that all is not as it should be. We are promised some documents on this matter soon. As there have been so many notices of them creating suspicions, it is their duty and the duty of the brethren to have the matter decided forthwith.

☞THIS number was prepared under great disadvantages. Serious domestic afflictions will, I doubt not, by our readers be accepted as an apology for its defects, and by our correspondents for any apparent neglect of them,

Erratum.—No. 5, p. 231, for "*seuttle,*" read *cuttle*, 16th line from bottom.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Number VII.——Volume V.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Bethany, Va. July, 1834.

Praying in the Spirit.

WHEN Moses' hands were lifted up towards heaven Israel prevailed over Amelek; but when Moses' hands pointed to the earth Amalek prevailed over Israel. Paul forgot not this instructive incident in the figurative fortunes of the ancient elect of God: for when he furnishes the Christian soldier with a new coat of mail from the armory of the great Captain of Salvation, he reminds him that his panoply alone will not save him; but, "lifting up holy hands," he must, "with all supplication and deprecation, pray at all times;" and for this very purpose, watch with all perseverance and supplication for all the saints.

"Is any man afflicted?" (says James, that illustrious pillar in the Christian temple,) "*let him pray.*" "In my distress," says David, "I called upon the Lord, and cried to my God: he heard my voice out of his temple, and my cry came before him, even into his ears. I will call upon the Lord, who is worthy to be praised; so shall I be saved from my enemies."

The great Captain of our Salvation often retired into secret places, and spent much time in prayer to God. Once he went out into a mountain to pray, and continued the whole night in an oratory or place of prayer. This was before he selected his Apostles. At another time he retired into a mountain to pray, and continued alone most of the day and night. The more severe his temptations and trials, the more earnestly he prayed. "Being in an agony," says Luke, "he prayed the more earnestly."

The saints of all dispensations and ages have been "men of God;" they were much in prayer to God; and the Apostles of Jesus make this one of the distinguishing characteristics of a saint. Speaking of that class of widows who are worthy of honor in the Christian

communities, Paul finishes with this as the consummation of Christian character: "She trusts in God, and continues in supplications and prayers night and day." Such, indeed, was the character of the distinguished Jews: for the daughter of Phanuel, in the times of the greatest defection in Israel, "served God in prayer and fasting night and day."

It is, then, in all conformity with the best models of piety in all ages of the world, that Jesus taught his disciples to ask, to seek, to knock at the door of mercy—to persevere in prayer. He pictured out God's elect as those "who cried to God day and night." It is in the same philosophy that Paul commanded Christians to be instant or "steadfastly persevering in prayer." In one sentence, Paul commands, "*Pray without ceasing.*"

The original gospel and order of things, without this original "spirit of grace and supplication" and this ancient and venerable practice of all saints, will fail in bringing us who make this profession into the full enjoyment of the blessings of the kingdom of heaven. For this there is no substitute. No person can live and walk with God, nor enjoy that communion with the Father and the Son, which they in the beginning enjoyed, unless we walk in their steps—unless, like them, we continue instant in supplications, and prayers, and thanksgivings, night and day. This being without argument conceded, and indeed acknowledged by the pious of all parties, we proceed to offer a few remarks on *praying in spirit.*

It is agreed that there is a praying without speaking aloud. Such was the prayer of Hannah, most acceptable to God. "She spake in her heart, only her lips moved, but her voice was not heard; therefore, Eli thought that she was drunken." This speaking in the heart, or praying in the spirit, is not only practicable in the midst of all the business of life; but it is the only way in which the apostolic exhortation of "praying without ceasing" can be obeyed. It is, indeed, every way compatible with propriety for saints to utter ejaculations, or to express a single petition in the midst of conversation or business. Jacob, in blessing his sons, in the midst of his benedictions and prophetic annunciations of future times, ejaculates, "I have waited for thy salvation, O Lord!" And David, when informed that his counsellor Ahitophel had deserted him and associated with the conspirators, on hearing of his defection, ejaculates, "O Lord! I pray thee turn the counsel of Ahitophel into foolishness!" Of these extemporaneous and insulated prayers and supplications we have many examples in both Testaments.

The Apostles, in the midst of their compositions and epistles, occasionally pray in this extemporaneous and detached style. When speaking of the defection of Phygellus and Hermogenus, Paul exclaims, "May the Lord grant mercy to the family of Onesiphores, for he oft refreshed me and was not ashamed of my chain!!" When telling the Thessalonians how often he had prayed that he might see their face—"praying exceedingly night and day"—he adds, "Now God himself, and our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ direct our way to you!"

From these specimens, to which many might be added, we may learn how we may "pray without ceasing" and in spirit for every thing lawful and desirable.

To sing and pray "with the understanding," is to sing and pray aloud and intelligibly—to sing and pray in the spirit, is to sing and pray for our own edification and comfort. Paul would practise both. So ought all who value his example.

Prayer has been so much abused, like every other institution of Heaven—so perverted into a sort of converting ordinance, that many disciples, disgusted with these abuses, appear to reason as if they had fallen into the opposite error. Extremes, indeed, very generally beget each other: from its perihelion the comet, of every ellipsis, hastens to its aphelion. Because our Lord reprobated the unmeaning repetitions, the much speaking, and the speaking at random in prayer practised by the Pagans, some seem to think that praying seldom is more compatible with our intelligence and circumstances than praying often; and, indeed, we have met with some little philosophers who pretend that it is not so necessary to our perfection and happiness as in the times of comparative ignorance and distress. 'Why,' say they, 'pray so much and so often, when God has blessed us with all the riches of heaven and earth? Thanksgiving rather is proper.'

Drinking a little deeper into the spirit of Christianity will convince every disciple that prayer and thanksgiving are still as needful to holiness and happiness as in the times of the Apostles and Prophets. It is rather *out of fashion*, we confess, to find persons continuing in prayers and supplications night and day, and whose conversation is so much in heaven as to abound with thanksgivings and ejaculatory petitions in the spirit and style of the ancient and venerable confessors and disciples of the Messiah, or even after the example of the pious sons and daughters of Abraham. *But it is just as needful now as ever.* We have the same warfare to maintain—the same enemies without, and the same antagonist principles within. We have the triple alliance of the world, the flesh, and satan opposed to our entrance into the heavenly city, and need all that armor of God so necessary to the triumph of those who first enlisted under the great Captain of the Faith. Social and secret prayer are as necessary to spiritual health and comfort as the natural aliments are to physical health. But the only proper preparation for these is the spirit of grace and supplication—this constant praying in the spirit, which creates a relish for communion with God in the closet and in the society of kindred spirits.

Prayer is the expression of desire; and desire is the effect of the discovery of needed good. Good must be perceived and its need felt before it can be desired; and it must be desired before it is asked; and it must be received before we can feel grateful or thankful for it. This is the order in which nature has placed this subject before us; so that he who would abound in supplications and prayers, must perceive the good things which he needs—must feel that he does need them, and believe that God is the rewarder of all them who diligently seek his favors.

Meditation, self-examination, or what is called communing with the heart, communing with oneself, accompanied with the reading and study of the word, is the way, and the only way, to discover our wants, and the way to supply them; and to create those desires which will cause our spirits to breathe towards the skies and to pour themselves out in prayer and praise to God.

"Have you no words? Ah! think again;
Words flow apace when you complain!
Can you not fill a mortal's ear
With the sad tale of all your care?
Were half the breath, thus vainly spent,
To heaven in supplication sent,
Your cheerful song would oft'ner be
Hear what the Lord has done for me!" EDITOR.

Angels of the Seven Asiatic Congregations.

DANVILLE, *Ky.* April 24, 1834.

Brother Campbell,

BEING in conversation a few days ago with a gentleman of high standing for learning and piety, among other things the *new translation* was spoken of. Dr. Cleland's noted pamphlet was first mentioned, and my friend appeared much amused at the triumphant conclusion which Dr. Cleland drew from his own criticism on the Greek word *anastas*, which occupies so conspicuous a place in that gentleman's pamphlet—that Paul was baptized while standing up. He also said, on the other hand, he was surprised to see somewhere a criticism of yours intended to sustain the rendering of Rev. ii. 1, 8, 12, &c. &c. as it stands in the New Translation—"*By* the messenger of the congregation of Ephesus," &c. "write." He gave his reasons for dissenting, which I requested him to commit to writing; a copy of which I enclose you for the Harbinger, concluding that you will treat them with that respect and attention they deserve—as coming from so respectable a source—a Paidobaptist of high standing and extensive influence. S. A.

"*Unto the angel of the church of,*" &c. "*write.*"—Rev. 1, 8, 18.—iii. 1, 7, 14.

The proposed translation refers to two points, "*unto*" and "*by,*" and also the translation "*messenger,*" instead of the transfer into English of "*angel.*" The present paper has nothing to do with the latter point, but relates solely to the former.

It is contended that the dative case of the Greek sometimes admits the use in translation of the prepositions "with" or "by," as well as of the prepositions "to" or "unto." Granted. But is such a use admissible in the case before us? Never! and for the reasons following:—

1st. This is a plain case of the "*dative of the person,*" as it is called; not of the dative of the "*means by which*"

2d. It is the customary form of beginning letters "to" persons or churches. See Acts xv. 23. (in the Greek.) "The Apostles," &c. "*to* the brethren," &c. "greeting." See also the beginning of every apostolic letter. Rom. i. 2, 7. "Paul, *to* those in Rome." James i. 1. "James *to* the twelve tribes," &c. 1 Peter i. 1. Peter "*to* the chosen," &c. 2 John i. "The old man, *to* the chosen lady," &c. So in this case; Rev. i. 4. "John *to* the seven churches." Rev. ii. 1. "*Unto* the angel of the church of Ephesus, write."

3d. When a Greek meant to state by whom his letter was sent, he said, "By the hands of" such a one. Acts xv. 23. "Writing by their hands thus." Acts xi. 30. "By the hands of Barnabas and Saul."

If this be not a case of *the dative of the person,* then no person or persons are mentioned to whom John wrote; and the sentences are incomplete, as they never are in this respect in the Greek. "By the messenger of the church of Ephesus write." To whom? To the body of Christians at Ephesus? This is a mere conjecture. But the text is against it; the pronouns are in the singular, referring to angel, not to the body of Christians. Rev. ii. 2, 3, 4, &c. "I know *thy* works"—"*thou* hast borne"—"against *thee,*" &c. &c.

In reply to the above criticism, we would remark, that if those who do dissent from us on any subject, would, with equal candor and argument, present their objections, they would be entitled to our thanks, and should always receive a candid and respectful attention. The writer and his remarks are entitled to respect.

The criticism to which he alludes as offered by us in favor of *by*, is not found in the notes to any edition of the new version. He must, therefore, allude to some remarks in the Christian Baptist in support of the hypothesis, *that the messengers or angels of the churches addressed by Jesus in the Apocalypse, were the persons* BY WHOM *the letters were sent to the congregations, and not the individuals* TO WHOM *the letters were written.*

He waves all discussion about the *nature* or *office* of those seven angels, as well as the merits of the translation *messenger* in preference to the transfer *angel,* and confines himself to the single question, Whether the laws of the language authorize the translation, "*By* the messenger or angel of the church." He concedes that the dative case of the Greek sometimes admits of the use in translation of the preposition *with* or *by;* but affirms that it cannot be admitted here—because "*this is a plain case of the dative of the person.*" Were it so, and there is a strong probability that it is, he is right; and it should be rendered *to* or *for* the angel write, &c. So strong is the probability that it is a case of the dative of the person to or for whom a thing is done, that it was with considerable hesitancy that we continued *by* in the late editions.

That the reader may perceive the whole difficulty of the case and the amount of evidence on both sides, we shall state the two laws or rules of translation by which the question is to be decided. That on which he relies is—

The person or persons for whom any thing is said to be, or to be done, is put in the dative; and in our language ought to be preceded by the preposition *to* or *for.*

That on which I rely, is—The cause, manner, or *instrument* by whom or by which any thing is said to be, or to be done, is put in the dative, and in our language ought to be preceded by the preposition *by* or *with.* These are laws of equal authority and uniformity in the language of the New Testament. It is also agreed by us both that this is the dative case; but whether the dative of the *person,* or the dative of the *instrument,* is the question. He says it is a plain case of the dative of the person, and advances the customary form of beginning letters to persons or churches in proof. For this it is granted

he has much evidence, and all the cases he has urged are in point, and justify *to* rather than *by*.

His third item and second argument, however correct in the general, bear not directly upon this question; because the places he has quoted, and others of the same class, are found in the genitive with *dia*, (*by* or *through*,) and we can find instances of the dative of the instrument in cases more analogous than those quoted. For example, Paul (Col. iv. 16.) uses the dative of the instrument exactly as we suppose it in the seven epistles before us. The common version of this passage is, "The salutation *by the hand* of me Paul." Supply the ellipsis, and the passage literally reads, 'I, Paul, write the salutation by my own hand.' Here there is no preposition in Greek. It is a simple dative of the instrument. Many instances of similar construction can be found in Greek writers, in the Septuagint of the Old Testament and in the New. Numbers xii. 2. we have two instances: "Hath the Lord only spokon *by Moses?* Hath the Lord not spoken *by us?*" Here it is the dative of the instrument in the judgment of many translators; yet it might be rendered, 'Has the Lord only spoken to Moses? Has the Lord not spoken to us?' But against the latter it may be urged that in such cases there is a preposition governing the accusative, as in Numbers v. "The Lord spoke *pros Mosen*, to Moses." Josh. xiv. 10. "Ever since the Lord spoke this word *pros Mosen*, to Moses." So that in Numb. xii. 2. it is the dative of the instrument, and ought to be rendered, 'Has the Lord only spoken *by* Moses? Has not the Lord spoken *by* us.' In John's Testimony we have this same style of the dative of the instrument: "We know that God spoke *by* Moses." And be it observed that verbs of *speaking* and *writing* are of the *same construction as respects both the dative of the person and of the instrument*. It is not, then, without authority that we consider the dative under discussion as the dative of the instrument; though we admit that if there were no other difficulty in the passage, the probability is here more in favor of the dative of the person: because the cases urged by the gentleman are more numerous and more in accordance with general usage.

But he adds, If this be not a dative of the person, then no persons are addressed; for we cannot suppose the churches, inasmuch as the singular pronoun is always used to the end of each epistle. This is my strongest reason for regarding it as the dative of the instrument; because *the angel of the church*, if addressed, is addressed like no other angel in the universe. He is addressed as a *singular plural*, not as the messenger of a congregation, but as the guardian angel of a whole community, who alone is responsible for the behavior of a province. An anomaly if the dative of the person—a greater anomaly by far than that this should be a dative of the instrument. For the sake of argument, admit that the dative of the instrument in such cases is rare; but if the dative of the person, is not such a person as an angel or messenger of a church exclusively the object of praise and blame much more rare—nay, wholly unprecedented in the New Testament. Of two difficulties, then, we choose the less. This after reconsi-

deration, and after giving the most respectful attention to the argument of this gentleman, the reason why we think the translation *by the messenger*, preferable to the translation *to the messenger* or *angel of the church*.

Besides, when we read the whole connexion, we find the objects of the address are not seven angels, but seven independent congregations. "What thou seest write in a book, and send it to the seven churches in Asia—to Ephesus, to Smyrna, to Pergamos, to Thyatira, to Sardis, to Philadelphia, to Laodicea."—Com. Ver. Again, what is written to the churches implies such a difference amongst the elements which compose them, as to make the letter inapplicable to one person, unless, as before supposed, that this person was wholly and exclusively responsible for the whole community.

The construction of the dative of the person, however, being more in accordance with the general usage of the New Testament, I hesitated between *by* and *for*, and must still say that perhaps *for* is preferable to either *by* or *to*. *By* is more definite, but *for* will exactly accord with all that this gentleman has said, and with all that can be said in favor of the dative of the person. For the angel or messenger of such a church write. It being intended, however, that it should terminate upon the church, the messenger is, and must, in effect, be regarded as but the instrument; consequently no detriment to the sense is sustained in using either *by* or *for*. Such are my reasonings and conclusions upon this long agitated question.

Many think that "angel of the church" is only another name for bishop of the church. John does not, however, call them *the* angels of the churches, but "the seven stars are angels of seven congregations;" which style better suits the idea of persons not established in office, but as persons appointed for some purpose. As John was in Patmos, and as his epistles must be carried to the congregations, it is no way unnatural to suppose that the Lord should have told him to write so and so for the messenger of each congregation—that these messengers were sent from the congregations to John in his exile, and that by them John sent what he was commanded to write for each assembly.

With Dr. George Campbell, in his Lectures on Ecclesiastical History, we fully agree that of all the opinions current in his day concerning these angels, that is the most probable which supposes them to be the president of each congregation, called, in the Jewish style, "the messenger of the synagogue"—because he delivered and pronounced the decisions of the eldership on all questions which came before them; and to him were addressed all communications belonging to the congregations. But with him we also think that it is bad logic to explain the clear and unfigurative accounts of church officers found in the Acts and in the Epistles, by the figurative and more obscure sayings of the Apocalypse; and therefore we think that the Epistles and the Acts of Apostles are our safest guide, and do warrant us in regarding these messengers of the congregations as before explained.

EDITOR.

New Version Defended---No. 8.

MR. SMITH, in his *Recorder* of February 8th continues his strictures on the New Version. After having exhausted his ingenuity on my supposed leanings to Unitarianism in the instances which we have laid before our readers, he next selects the word *congregation*, and affects to represent us as not dealing fairly by Dr. Campbell, because he thought it good in translating Matth. xvi. 18. to retain the word *church*. It is strange he did not array Doddridge against us in this instance also.

Some of our *learned* opponents have recently affirmed that we have no authority for saying that Dr. Doddridge ever translated any part of the New Testament. A correspondent has requested us to prove that we did not translate the Acts of the Apostles and the Apocalypse, and falsely call it the work of Doddridge: for it is asserted that Doddridge never translated any part of the New Testament. Now as we cannot send a messenger to carry a copy of Doddridge's translations to every one who doubts its existence, we shall have to apply to Mr. Smith to certify for us at least that Dr. Doddridge did actually translate the whole New Testament; he may add, if he pleases, that we have not, however, given it fairly. We are now only concerned to sustain the position that Doddridge did actually translate the book in question. But it just occurs to us that if we should obtain a certificate from Mr. Smith, those who are so courageous as now to hazard such an assertion, would become bolder, and say we had forged the certificate! Such is the recklessness of truth and justice on the side of the opposition.

I am expecting that the *Baptists* will soon attack the New Version, and that it is in the bounds of possibility that I may be accused as having some designs against Christian immersion, so far at least as a *believing* subject is concerned: for on examination it will be found that Acts viii. 37. one of the most clear and unequivocal proofs of that proposition, is thrown out of the text, and placed among the spurious readings in the Appendix to the New Version.

Upon the whole, we are almost confirmed in the conviction that honesty and impartiality have almost disappeared from the ranks of polemics, and partizan editors, and preachers: for this very reason, that they cannot even imagine the possibility of the existence of these good qualities in any one. They think that self-interest or some sinister motive dictates every action; and therefore they seek to find some lurking design, or fraud, or artifice in every change found in the New Version. They cannot conceive that it is possible for any one to attempt such a work, and with perfect impartiality correct, amend, or reject a word, or phrase, or verse, which by a mistranslation is more favorable to one's own opinions or views, than it would be if corrected or made more accordant to the original. This we have actually done in numerous instances. I may one day show, by arithmetical calculation, that in more than all the specifications of Mr. Smith and Doctor Cleland, we have amended, corrected, and expunged, *against our own*

views on certain points regarded by the public as our favorite opinions. But Mr. Smith has not noticed these! Why? Charity would not say, Because he desired to condemn, and sought out topics on which he could most readily alarm the ignorant and unwary, rather than to commend, although there is overwhelming evidence of perfect impartiality. I say, Charity would not say this; and because Reason and Truth can say nothing else, we shall bid them be silent.

To return to the word *congregation*. According to *our* rule—HEAR BOTH SIDES—we give the whole critique, *verbatim et punctuatim:*—

"Mr. Campbell says in his Appendix, No. 15; 'Wherever the word *church* is found in the common version, *congregation* will be found in this. We shall let Doctors Campbell and Doddridge defend this preference; for although they have not always so rendered it, they give the best of reasons why it should be always so translated.' "These reasons may satisfy *Mr. Campbell* that the word *congregation* should 'ALWAYS' be used instead of *church*, but they were never designed by the writers above quoted to have such an effect. They thought that in some cases, but not in all, the former term was more expressive of the sense of the original, than the latter. Dr. Campbell expressly declares this in the note on Matt. xviii. 17, partially quoted from him in the work before us, which *there* is made to conclude as follows:

'Whatever foundation, therefore, there may be from these books of scripture which concern a later period, for the notion of a church representative, it would be contrary to all the rules of criticism to suppose that our Lord used this term in a sense wherein it could not then be understood by any one of his hearers; or that he would say *congregation*, for so the word literally imports, when he meant only a few heads or directors."

"What may be the views of Mr. Campbell with respect to the church of Christ, or what may be his particular purpose in terming it invariably "the congregation" we can only conjecture. This however is of no importance; our only object is to show that those who agree with Mr. Campbell in this respect agree with him alone and not with Dr. Campbell, by whose language he *appears* to be sustained.

"If the reader wishes to learn how far he may repose confidence in the professions of Mr. Campbell, let him read attentively the extract above quoted, and weigh well the meaning which, in connexion with the prefatory remark, it appears to bear. Then let him turn to the note in question in the original, and read *the six lines* which follow Mr. Campbell's extract, concluding the paragraph, all of which but this he has quoted. They are as follows:—

'L. Cl. [Le Clerc] renders this passage in the same manner, *dites le a l'assemble.* But in chap. xvi. 18, where our Lord manifestly speaks of all, without exception, who to the end of the world should receive him as the Messiah, the Son of the living God, I have retained the word *church* as being perfectly unequivocal.'

"Mr. A. Campbell's 'emendation' of *Matt.* xvi. 18, is as follows:—'I tell you likewise, you are named Stone, and on this rock I will build my congregation, over which the gates of Hades shall not prevail.' "We assure our readers that we quote without the change of a word or a letter.

"Mr. Campbell dauntlessly carries his 'emendation' through the New Testament, fearless of consequences. We cannot but give him credit for consistency, (at least in this 'emendation') when he makes St. Paul say of himself (Phil. iii. 6,) 'with respect to zeal persecuting the congregation;' and of Christ (Col. i. 18, 24.) that 'he is the head of the body, even the congregation.' This certainly might be termed a *reductio ad absurdum*, but we suppose Mr. Campbell proposes to himself the motto, *fiat justitia, ruat cœlum.*"

What are the *allegata* here? What the accusation? In the first place, this critic knows full well what to suppress, as well as how far

to quote. The honest and impartial reader need not to be told why he suppressed the following note found in the New Version, while he *pretends to give his readers all my reasons for the preference*, taken from Campbell and Doddridge. He has suppressed the following:—

"Doddridge, on Matt. xviii. 17. says, 'This is one of those many *scriptures* which would have been very intelligible if they had not been learnedly obscured by ingenious men, whose interest it has been to spread a cloud over them. I am more and more convinced that the *vulgar sense* of the *New Testament*, that is, the sense in which an honest man of plain sense would take it on his first reading the *original*, or any good *translation*, is almost every where the true general sense of any passage; though an acquaintance with *language* and *antiquity*, with an attentive meditation on the text and context, may illustrate the spirit and energy of a multitude of places in a manner which could not otherwise be learned. The old English editions of 1539 and 1541 render it, *Tell it to the congregation;* and, I think, properly enough. The word *church* is unhappily grown into a *term of art*, and has by different persons a variety of *secondary ideas* annexed to it, as Dr. Watts has beautifully shown in his *Essay on Uncharitableness*, p. 7—10. But it signifies in general *an assembly*, or number of people, *called together* on whatever occasion, as is well known. [Compare Acts xix. 32, 39.] It is in the New Testament generally used, as here, for a *particular assembly*, Acts xiv. 23. 1 Cor. iv. 17. xiv. 23. xvi. 19. but sometimes it is used for the *whole body of Christians*, because they are now *called out from the world*, and are at last to be *gathered together* in the presence of Christ their head, (1 Thess. ii. 1.) and to dwell forever with each other and with him.'

"Campbell, on the same passage, observes, 'I know no way of reaching the sense of our Lord's instructions, but by understanding his words so as they must have been understood by his hearers, from the use that then prevailed. The word εκκλησια occurs frequently in the Septuagint, and is that by which the Hebrew *kahal* is commonly translated. That word we find used in two different, but related senses, in the Old Testament. One is for a whole nation, considered as constituting one commonwealth or polity. In this sense the people of Israel are denominated πασα η εκκλησια Ισραηλ, and πασα η εκκλησια Θεου. The other is for a particular *congregation* or *assembly*, either actually convened, or accustomed to convene in the same place. In this sense it was applied to those who were wont to assemble in any particular synagogue, for every synagogue had its own εκκλησια. And as the word συναγωγη was sometimes employed to signify, not the house, but the people, those two Greek words were often used promiscuously. Now as the nature of the thing sufficiently shows that our Lord, in this direction, could not have used the word in the first of the two senses above given, and required that every private quarrel should be made a national affair, we are under a necessity of understanding it in the last as regarding the particular congregation to which the parties belonged. What adds great probability to this, as Lightfoot and others have observed, is the evidence we have that the like usage actually obtained in the synagogue, and in the primitive church."

All this is left out of the account; and because Dr. George Campbell retained the word *church* for the sake of the metaphor *build upon a rock* in Matth. xvi. 18. the gentleman calls upon his readers "to learn (from this parable) how far he may repose confidence in the professions of Mr. C——." What professions have been falsified here? Surely this Mr. Smith is an unworthy minister of the congregation of English episcopacy—I should have said, *Church of England.*

Just at this moment I opened for the first time Matth. xvi. 18. in an English version of the New Testament, title wanting, beginning with John Calvin's preface, supposed to be an early impression of the

Bishop's Bible, the most ancient I have seen. I obtained it from a friend in Baltimore last winter. This passage, at which Mr. Smith stares so much as to affright his readers, thus reads, *verbatim et literatim:*—"Vpon this rocke I wil builde my congregation. And the gates of hel shal not ouercome it." But what incongruity in the word *congregation* here more than in calling Christ *the head of the church.* The head of the community, or the congregation, or the assembly is to my optics as clear and intelligible as the head of the church.

But Mr. Smith goes for *sound*, and prefers monosyllables to polysyllables. But why not contend for the word *kirk?* Because the *Kirk* of Scotland has no head! but King Harry was the head of the *Church* of England! So be it, Mr. Smith. This is as good logic as you have to offer. I go for uniformity always where it mars not the sense, and you do not even pretend to say that the word *kirk* or *church* represents the word *ecclesia.* You may think that congregation would not suit your St. Paul's, St. John's, St. Matthews', and St. Jesus' *brick* churches; and perhaps you are right. But you ought to blame the *original* and not the *translation;* for if *congregation* or *assembly* suit the word once, it will not make either bad sense or nonsense to have it as often in English as we have *ecclesia* in Greek. A note of admiration being all your logic here, I shall leave that and your "*reductio ad absurdum*," found in Paul's persecuting a community, rather than in his persecuting brick and stone walls, to your own reflections for another month. EDITOR.

The Gift of the Holy Spirit---No. 4.

BEFORE we speak of "*the fruit of the Spirit*," and of "*the first fruits of the Spirit*," we think it necessary to extend our vision, and bring into our horizon what is spoken about the Spirit in the ages of the world antecedent to the Christian economy. We shall, therefore, glance through the ancient oracles.

There is not in the Jewish and Christian Scriptures a word of more diversified occurrence and of greater variety of meaning, than the word *spirit.* It occurs very often without any epithet, and we find it in the following connexions:—Holy Spirit, Spirit of God, Spirit of Christ, Spirit of the Lord, Spirit of the Lord God, Spirit of adoption, Spirit of antichrist, Spirit of the Arabians, Spirit of bondage, Spirit of burning, Spirit of counsel, Spirit of divination, Spirit of Egypt, Spirit of error, Spirit of fear, Spirit of fear of the Lord, Spirit of glory, Spirit of grace, Spirit of jealousy, Spirit of judgment, Spirit of infirmity, Spirit of knowledge, Spirit of heaviness, Spirit of holiness, Spirit of life, Spirit of meekness, Spirit of might, Spirit of your mind, Spirit of the Philistines, Spirit of promise, Spirit of prophecy, Spirit of slumber, Spirit of his son, Spirit of truth, Spirit of understanding, Spirit of whoredoms, Spirit of wisdom.

We have also another class of combinations of this word; such as broken spirit, dumb spirit, evil spirit, free spirit, foul spirit, faithful

spirit, good spirit, humble spirit, meek spirit, new spirit, patient spirit, perverse spirit, quickening spirit, quiet spirit, sorrowful spirit, unclean spirit, wounded spirit.

Add to these the phrases, Born of the Spirit, Earnest of the Spirit, Fruit of the Spirit, First fruits of the Spirit, Newness of Spirit, Love of the Spirit, Mind of the Spirit, Sword of the Spirit, Demonstration of the Spirit, Manifestation of the Spirit, Ministration of the Spirit, Sanctification of the Spirit, Grieve not the Holy Spirit, Quench not the Spirit, Resist the Holy Spirit, Blaspheme the Holy Spirit.

Cruden, in his Concordance, ascribes *nineteen* different acceptations or significations to the word *Spirit* as found in both Testaments. Calmet attempts to generalize them under four distinct heads of signification, but evidently fails. Brown also makes an abortive attempt of the same sort.

Even when the *Spirit of God* is spoken of, it does not always mean the same thing. The Spirit of God sometimes unequivocally means *the breath of natural life*. Thus in Job xxvii. 3. "The Spirit of God is in my nostrils, all the while the breath is in me." The four winds are in the same metaphor, called the four spirits of the heavens. Zech. vi. 5. The Spirit of God moving upon the face of the great deep, may also be a figurative expression; for the Hebrews were accustomed to express their superlative comparison by adding the word *God* as an adjective to a noun. Thus "the cedars of God," "the hills of God," "the mountains of God," were very lofty cedars, hills, and mountains. However this may be, we find the phrase does not always mean the same thing.

The "Spirit of God" in the Old Testament is spoken of thirteen times only. When Pharoah discovered the divine wisdom which was found in Joseph after he interpreted his visions, he said to his servants, "Can we find such a man as this Joseph, in whom the Spirit of God is?" The Lord also called Bezaleel of the tribe of Judah and "filled him with the Spirit of God, in wisdom, understanding, and knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship." The "Lord put wisdom in the hearts of all who were wise hearted," who with Aholiab and Bezaleel were to construct the tabernacle and its furniture as the Lord commanded Moses. "The Spirit of God came upon Balaam, (Num. xxiv. 2.) upon Saul, (1 Sam. x. 10. xi. 6.) and upon the messengers of Saul, (xix. 20.) and they all prophesied." The Spirit of God in like manner "came upon Azariah, and he preached to Asa, to Judah, and Benjamin," (2 Chron. xv. i.) Ezekiel says, (xi. 24.) "The Spirit took me up and brought me in vision by the Spirit of God into Chaldea." This is all we learn of the Spirit of God from the Old Testament.

But although we have not this phrase more frequently in the Old Testament, much is said of *the Spirit*, in the ancient revelations. The Lord took of the Spirit that was upon Moses, and put it upon the seventy senators appointed to the government of Israel with Moses; and when the Spirit came upon them they prophesied without intermission. Num. xi. 17, 25. When Moses heard of their prophesying,

he said, Would to God that all the Lord's people were Prophets, and that *the Lord would put his Spirit* upon them!

Caleb and Joshua are spoken of as men possessing another spirit—the spoken doubtless allusively to the Spirit of God. The spirit of Elijah means the spirit which God bestowed upon him, which also rested upon Elisha. The spirit came upon Amasa, one of David's captains, as the spirit of courage; and the same spirit gave a pattern of the Temple to David, according to which it was erected. 1 Chron. xviii. 21. This spirit dwelt in all the prophets. Neh. ix. 39. David prayed to be upheld by God's free spirit. An excellent spirit was found in Daniel, and God by Solomon promised to pour out his Spirit upon all who turned to the Lord. "Turn, you sinners, at my reproof, and I will pour out my Spirit upon you."

But the phrase "*Spirit of the Lord*" frequently occurs in the Old Testament. It is found twenty-six times, and is always used synonymously with the Spirit of God. It, as well as the Spirit of God, sometimes signifies the *wind*. Isaiah xl. 7. "The grass withereth, the flower fadeth, because the spirit of the Lord bloweth upon it. Surely the people is grass!" It came on the great warriors and judges of Israel—on Othniel, on Gideon, on Jepthah, on Samson, on Saul, on David, on Jehaziel, upon Isaiah, upon Ezekiel, and upon Micah, and upon all the prophets. All who had "the Spirit of the Lord," or "the Spirit of God," in this age of the world, were supernaturally endowed in some respect or other.

"*My Spirit*," in the mouth of the Lord, occurs *ten* times in the Old Testament. He promises to pour out his Spirit upon all flesh—upon all who returned to him—upon all the seed of Israel—upon the Messiah—upon the prophets. This, of course, will be found in the same acceptation of the phrase "Spirit of God," "Spirit of the Lord," unless we regard it prospectively in reference to other influences promised in the times of the Messiah. This, however, only applies to those promises applicable to the Christian age.

"*Holy Spirit*," in the first four thousand years of the world is only found three times. David and Isaiah are the only prophets who use it. David says, (Psalm li.) "Take not thy Holy Spirit from me;" and Isaiah, (lxiii. 10, 11.) says of Israel, in reference to God's miraculous care of them, "They rebelled and vexed his Holy Spirit; therefore, he turned to be their enemy, and he fought against them. Then he remembered the days of old, Moses and his people, saying, Where is he that brought them up out of the sea with the Shepherd of his flock? Where is he that put his Holy Spirit within him, that led them by the right hand of Moses with his glorious arm, dividing the water before them to make himself an everlasting name?" From this we discover that the Holy Spirit is used as equivalent to the Spirit of God bestowed on Moses and Joshua, to the Spirit of the Lord which fell on the *saviours* of Israel.

It is here worthy of remark, that the King's translators did never use the phrase *Holy Ghost* in translating the Old Testament. On three occasions they ought, upon their own principles, to have used it;

for it is the same phrase, which, in the New Testament, with four exceptions, they have uniformly translated "*Holy Ghost.*"

Pneuma hagion, or *to Pneuma to hagion*, occurs ninety four times in the New Testament. Ninety times they translated it *Holy Ghost*, and four times *Holy Spirit*. Curiosity is inquisitive to find some reason for these four exceptions. They are found Luke xi. 13. Eph. i. 13. iv. 30. 1 Thess. iv. 8. In Luke xi. 13. there is no article—it simply reads, "Give a holy spirit to them that ask him." They did not say, 'Give a *holy ghost*.' Why? Is it because there is no article? We shall examine the other passages and see whether they are uniform in this. Eph. i. 13. iv. 30. and 1 Thess. iv. 8. the article is found. Besides, in many other places, where the article is not found, they have *Holy Ghost*. Is it because what Luke calls "Holy Ghost," Matthew, in quoting the same passage of Christ's discourse, (chap. vii. 11.) uses "*good things*"? Probably it was; for they seem to use "Holy Ghost" as if by it a person was always intended; at least, this will apply to the New Testament: for we have seen they have no Holy Ghost in the Old Testament. But then it will be asked, Are they uniform in this? Is not their Holy Ghost meant Ephesians i. 13. and iv. 30. and 1 Thess iv. 8.? It would appear so. But the construction is peculiar in Eph. i. 13. for the arrangement is, 'You are sealed by the spirit of the promise, the holy:' and as the King's translators promised only the Holy Spirit in the Old Testament, and not the Holy Ghost, they could not with propriety speak of a promised Holy Ghost: for in chap. iv. 30. they seem to have their eyes turned back to Isaiah lxiii. 11, where they rendered it, "Grieve his Holy Spirit," and therefore they cannot say, 'Grieve not the Holy Ghost of God,' the figure in Isaiah lxiii. 10, 11, being the same found in Eph. iv. 30. They prefer to agree with themselves in the Old Testament, rather than with themselves in the New. And in the last place, 1. Thess. iv. 8. we can find no reason, except that they found it incongruous to use Holy Ghost in reference to God himself—"Who has given to us his Holy Spirit," rather than his *Holy Ghost*. This is, in all candor, all we can say in their defence. There is, therefore, no good reason for preferring *Ghost* to *Spirit ninety* times to *four* in the New Testament.

There is a saying found in the covenant subscribed by Nehemiah, the governor, twenty-two priests, seventeen Levites, and forty-four chiefs of Israel, which is worthy of attention here. The Tirshatha, (Nehemiah ix. 20.) speaking of the instructions given to Israel in the wilderness by Moses and Aaron, says, "Thou gavest also thy *good Spirit* to instruct them, and withheldest not thy manna from their mouth, and gavest them water for their thirst;" and in verse 30, speaking of the various prophets sent to remonstrate with Israel, he says, "Thou testifiedst against them by the Spirit in thy prophets; yet would they not give ear."

The good Spirit, the holy Spirit, the Spirit of God, the Spirit of the Lord, thy spirit, and my spirit, as applied to God in the Jewish Scriptures, when not used *metaphorically*, always indicates the spirit of

supernatural wisdom, knowledge, power, and goodness bestowed upon the prophets, the kings, the priests, the judges, the artificers, the great generals and illustrious men of Israel. It was the spirit of wisdom and revelation in Moses and in the prophets: it was the spirit of might, and power, and courage, in all the heroes and judges of Israel: the Joshuas, the Gideons, the Sampsons, the Davids, &c. it was the spirit of natural science and the fine arts in Bezaleel, Aholiab, and all the ingenious artificers that erected and beautified the Tabernacle and adorned the High Priest of God. It was the spirit of holiness and goodness in all the models of human excellence, which yet give a lustre and renown to the splendid names enrolled on Israel's historic page—which shed a celestial radiance around those magnificent constellations which will shine in the Jewish firmament forever and forever. EDITOR.

John Wesley's Small Points.

TO MR. WATERMAN.

My dear Sir,

AS you have been the occasion of calling my attention to John Wesley's "catholic spirit," and as in the embarrassment under which my last number was got up, I forgot to finish my reply to your letter, I have, on a re-perusal of the extracts you presented to me from his sermon on a "catholic spirit," thought them worthy of more attention than I have yet bestowed on them, and now proceed to offer you a few remarks on them.

Give me leave just to observe that the information which you say you received concerning my affirming, in a public discourse, that Mr. Wesley had gone to destruction because he did not preach immersion, is incorrect. I never said so. I am not in the habit of sending people to destruction in my public discourses. I have not said that much of Pope Leo, or any one since Judas Iscariot. Your admiration of Mr. Wesley's discourse, and commendation of it to me as a model of a truly catholic spirit, and my respect for your good sense, have induced me to give it a more attentive perusal. On examining it over and over, I must say that I am only the more astonished at your commendation of it. What is it that you admire in it? Is it the sacrifice and surrender of every article of Christian faith at the shrine of professed sincerity—of giving the hand in token of good intentions? Let us now with all candor see how much Mr. Wesley professes to surrender for the sake of getting the heart and the hand of good intentions:—

I. His mode of worship, which he believes to be primitive and apostolic. This he explains as embracing,

1. His church and congregation,
2. His form of church government,
3. His church officers,
4. His form of prayer,

5. The posture and manner of receiving the Lord's supper,
6. The form of administering baptism;
7. Nay, the Lord's supper itself,
8. Christian baptism itself.

"Let all these things stand by. My only question at present (of him with whom I would unite in love) is this: Is thy *heart* right, as my heart is with thy heart?" If he says *Yes*, he receives him in love as a Christian brother! This is a catholic spirit indeed!!—too catholic for the twelve Apostles!—too catholic for Jesus Christ himself! John teaches that if a man should say his heart is full of love—right with God—"I love God," and does not keep his commandments, "he is a *liar*, and the truth is not in him." But John Wesley loves him because he gives his hand and says his heart is right. Jesus also says, "If a man love me, he will keep my words." But Mr. Wesley will love a man as a Christian who will refuse obedience to every ordinance of Jesus Christ. "Let these stand by," says he; "give me your hand." You, friend Waterman, need not tell me that he afterwards explains what he means by "the heart right with God;" for when he asks, "Dost thou believe in God's being and perfections? Dost thou believe in the Lord Jesus Christ? Is he revealed in thy soul?"—he explains all this away by saying, "If thou art but sincerely desirous of it, and following on till thou attainest it, then thy heart is right—is with my heart—give me thy hand."

Then, in the second place, he surrenders the Christian faith, comprizing,

1. Faith in God's existence.
2. Faith in his perfections.
3. Faith in Jesus Christ—

provided only he "*be sincerely desirous of it*, and following on to attain it."

"I have," continues he to the man of his love, "no desire to dispute with you one moment on any of the preceding heads—let all these *small points* stand aside."

Such are Mr. Wesley's SMALL POINTS!! And what are the *great* points? A unit!—"*Give me thy hand*"! "Love me as a brother in Christ." The small points are all ordinances and modes of worship, church order, officers, government, and even faith in Christ, provided there be a sincere desire of it, and an effort to obtain this unity of opinion!

Such a person Mr. Wesley regards, and wishes by him to be regarded, as "a companion in the kingdom and patience of Christ; and as one whose prayers are to be desired, and whose admonition and exhortation are to be sought after"! "Join with me in the work of the Lord," says he, "as far as you can"!

I cannot think that Mr. Wesley sincerely meant what he says in his sermon. I have too good an opinion of him to think any thing else than that he used words at random, without appreciating their value, especially in that part which respects faith in God and in Jesus Christ. Having repeated every thing else but the faith twice, I must,

indeed, regard his surrender of all things connected with the kingdom of Jesus as absolute and unconditional at the time he wrote that sermon.

On reading the extracts you have given, (to which I again refer the reader, pages 211 and '12 of the current volume,) the philosopher will find a suitable cause for the rapid and easy spread of *Methodism.* I would not thank any man of very ordinary talents, as one might say, to convert a thousand-a-year to give their hands in token of the sincerity of their desires, especially if the preacher had any tact in touching the passions. I see no yoke of Christ at all—no burthen, light or heavy, in such a system. The only outcry that could be raised against it would be from the priesthood, whose congregations were not well instructed. They might fear that such a scheme would carry off their congregations and leave them to dig or beg for bread. This might occasion the excommunication of preachers, and bring the *odium theologicum* upon the converts. But how to find a yoke or a burthen in such a system, would require the vision of an Argus and the discrimination of a Newton.

Although the extract you have quoted can grammatically and logically bear no other construction than that we, in the preceding remarks, put upon it; yet, suspecting that this could not be the foundation on which the Methodistic church was erected, I this moment opened "The Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, as stereotyped by J. Conner, New York, 1829," to see if any other foundation or bond of union was recognized or established.

On the 75th page, in chapter 2d, and section 1st, which is headed, "The Nature, Design, and General Rules of our United Societies," to my surprise and confirmation I find the following words:—"There is only one condition previously required of those who desire admission into these societies, viz.—*a desire to flee from the wrath to come and to be saved from their sins.*" But it may be supposed that for *continuance* in these societies (classes) some other bond of continuance is required. To assure myself of this matter I read the whole section, and find only the following words, *three times repeated*—"It is expected of all who continue therein, that they should continue to evidence their desire of salvation." Then follows the specified evidences of this desire.

From all which it appears as clear as day, that the *nature* of the association is "a desire in all the members to flee from the wrath to come, and to be saved from their sins." It follows, then, that the preceding extract is in good keeping with the nature and design of all the societies component of the Methodist Episcopal Church; and, therefore, there remains no more mystery in the easy and extensive prevalence of these societies. To convert a person to this religion, it is only necessary to lay before him the terrors of the wrath to come to excite him to flee from it; and to portray, in vivid and glowing colors, the joys of heaven, to allure him into a class.

In this class he is to live all the days of his pilgrimage, and he may never be baptized, eat the Lord's supper, or perform any act of obe-

dience to any *positive* institution of Jesus Christ. During his earthly pilgrimage he is to continue "desirous of fleeing from the wrath to come, and to be saved from his sins." All the rest are "*small things.*" His heart is right with God when he enters the class; and so long as he demeans himself in an orderly manner he is to be regarded as a worthy member of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

If I have misunderstood either the extract or the book of discipline, or if the Methodists have changed their views in these matters, I will be thankful to you, good sir, to set me to rights.

With me, Mr. Waterman, the success of any scheme, system, or party, is no argument for, or against it. As the stream can rise no higher than the fountain, and as Methodism is said to have originated with Mr. Wesley, I examine it now as I would have done (*ceteris paribus*) had I lived when he was expelled the University of Oxford, and saw him followed with only thirteen persons, A. D. 1735. The logic and scripture that could sustain it then will sustain it now; and with me it requires no less to sustain it now than would have been sufficient then. Is this good sound sense, or is it fanaticism? Is it incredulity, or will you call it uncharitable and uncourteous? Be it so. According to the organization of my mind, every religious system is to be tested—not by asking and answering the question, Who, or How many have received it—but by ascertaining *what say the Scriptures.*

As that Book teaches me that there is "one Lord, one faith, and one immersion," "one body" of Christ, and "one Spirit," as well as "one hope," and "one God and Father of all," you will please excuse me for asserting it as my conviction that any system which substitutes for this one condition —namely, "a desire to flee from the wrath to come, and to be saved from sin," is not of God but of men. For God cannot be the author of two systems, which in their nature, design, and operation so evidently and violently clash with each other.

I again repeat, if in aught I have misconceived or misrepresented the primitive and original Methodist Episcopal Church, as set forth in the extracts you have furnished, or in the book of Doctrine and Discipline above quoted, it will give me pleasure to be instructed by you more perfectly in the ways of John Wesley, and to learn the true value of that "catholic spirit" which you so tenderly and affectionately press upon my attention.

Anxious to hear from you, I remain yours as formerly,

EDITOR.



From the Moral Lyceum.

Duty of laboring assiduously and praying unceasingly for the Abolition of War.

WAR *ought to be abolished*, BECAUSE CHRISTIANITY FORBIDS IT. The revealed will of God is given to us. We may read it to ascertain our duty. No necessity is on us to know how it has been understood

by those of former days. It is pleasant, however, to know this. It may also, while we maintain that the Christian should be satisfied on questions connected with his duties, with scanning the rules and maxims of his religion, be conceded that the opinions of the earliest professors of Christianity are worthy of our notice wherever they were more likely than we to hold the system pure from those adulterations which previous examination has taught us have been introduced.

The argument will not be weakened if we next advert to the opinions and practice of the primitive Christians. It were easy to do this largely. He who would see the "great cloud of witnesses," is referred to those excellent, unanswered and unanswerable treatises, Dymond's "Inquiry into the Accordancy of War with Christianity," and Clarkson's "Essay on the Doctrines and Practice of the early Christians, as they relate to War."

Justin the Martyr, considered war unlawful, and the devil the author of all war. Tatian speaks in the same terms on the same subject, and Clemens, of Alexandria, is also decisive against the lawfulness of war.

Tertullian strongly condemns the practice of bearing arms. "Shall he, who is not to revenge his own wrongs, be instrumental in bringing others into chains, imprisonment, and death?—Cyprian is quoted to much the same purpose. Lactantius says, "It can never be lawful for a righteous man to go to war." To these may be added, Archelaus, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Jerome, and Cyril, all of whom were of opinion that it is unlawful for Christians to war.

Clemens Alexandrinus, A. D. 206, observes, that in his time, Christians were so far from wars, that they had no marks or signs of violence among them: "Neither sword nor bow to them that follow peace." Origen, A. D. 254, (on Luke xxii. 35,) thus remarks: "If any one looking to the *letter*, and not understanding the *spirit* of the words, shall sell his bodily garment and buy a sword, taking the words of Christ contrary to his will, he shall perish." Cyprian, A. D. 258, in his epistle to Donatus, says, "Suppose thyself with me, on the top of some very exalted eminence, and from thence look down upon the appearances of things beneath thee. The things thou wilt principally observe will be the highways beset with robbers, the seas with pirates; encampments, marches, and all the terrible forms of war and bloodshed. When a single murder was committed, it shall be deemed, perhaps, a crime; but that crime shall become a virtue, when committed under the shelter of public opinion, so that punishment is not rated by the measure of guilt, but the more enormous the size of the wickedness is, so much greater is the chance of impunity." Isidore, A. D. 430, says, "The great King of Heaven came down from above to deliver to the world the laws of a heavenly conversation [mode of life;] which he has proposed in a way of conflict and striving quite contrary to that of the Olympic games. There, he that fights and gets the better, receives the crown; here, he that is stricken, and bears it meekly, has the honor and applause; there, he that returns

blow for blow; here, he that turns the other cheek, is celebrated in the theatre of angels, for victory is measured not by revenge, but by a wise and generous patience. This is the new law of crowns; this is the new way of conflicts and contentions."

The first Christians believed that the fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaiah and other Prophets, concerning the Millennium, had already commenced. Thus, Ireneus, who flourished about the year 108, affirms that this prophecy had been completed in his time; "*For the Christians*," says he, "have changed their swords and their lances into instruments of peace, and *they know not how to fight*." Justin the Martyr, who was contemporary with Ireneus, also Tertullian and Theodoret asserted the same thing.

Celsus, who lived at the end of the second century, in attacking the Christian religion, made it one of his charges against the Christians, that they refused in his time to bear arms for the Emperor, even in the case of necessity, and when their services would have been accepted. He told them farther, that if the rest of the empire were of their opinion, it would soon be overrun by the Barbarians. Celsus dared not have brought that charge against the Christians, if the fact had not been publicly known. Origen, who lived in the third century, in his answer, admits the facts as stated by Celsus, that the Christians would not bear arms in his time, and justifies them for refusing the practice on the principles of the unlawfulness of war After Christianity had spread over almost the whole world, Tertullian, in speaking of a part of the Roman armies, including more than one-third of the standing legions of Rome, distinctly informs us that "*not one Christian could be found among them.*"

Instances are left on record of Christians perishing by the hand of the executioner, sooner than engage in war, such as the following:—

1. Maximalian having been brought before the tribunal, in order to be enrolled as a soldier, Dion the Proconsul asked him his name. Maximalian, turning to him, replied, "Wouldst thou know my name? *I am a Christian, and cannot fight?*" Dion then ordered him to be enrolled, and bade the officer mark him. But Maximalian refused to be marked, still asserting that he was a Christian; upon which Dion instantly replied, "Bear arms, or thou shalt die!"

To this Maximalian answered, "*I cannot fight if I die; I am not a soldier of this world*, but a soldier of God." Dion then said, "Who hath persuaded thee to behave thus?" Maximalian answered, "My own mind, and he who called me." Dion then spoke to Maximalian's father, and bade him persuade his son. But his father observed, that his son knew his own mind, and what it was best for him to do. After this had passed, Dion addressed Maximalian again in these words, "Take thy arms, and receive the mark." "I can receive," says Maximalian, "no such mark; I have already the mark of Christ." Upon which Dion said, "I will send thee quickly to thy Christ." "Thou mayest do so," said Maximalian; "but the glory will be mine." He was then led to the place of execution and put to death.

2. Marcellus was a centurion in the legion called Trajana. On a festival given in honor of the birth-day of Galerius, he threw down his military belt at the head of the legion, and, in the face of the standard, declared with a loud voice, that *he would no longer serve in the army; for he had become a Christian.* It is not lawful," said he, "for a Christian, who is the servant of Christ the Lord, to bear arms for any earthly consideration." After a delay of more than three months in prison, after this transaction, which delay was allowed for the purpose of sparing him, he was brought before the Prefect. There he had an opportunity of correcting his former expressions. But as he persisted in the same sentiments, he suffered. It is remarkable that almost immediately after his execution, Cassian, who was the notary to the same legion, refused to serve any longer, by publicly throwing his pen and account book on the ground, and declaring, at the same time, that the sentence of Marcellus was unjust. When taken up by the order of Aurelianus Agricolanus, he is described by the record preserved by Ruinart, to have avowed the same sentiments as Marcellus, and like him to have suffered death.

Such was Christianity in its uncorrupted, unsophisticated youth. Such in us may it be! R. M. C.

To this we say, Amen!—*Ed. M. H.*

A Difficulty worthy of Solution.

JAMESTOWN, *Ohio*, March 29, 1834.

Dear brother Campbell,

I FEAR that I am more troublesome to you than any other of your correspondents; but I must crave your indulgence, and if I am in the dark, must ask the favor of you to lead me out.

I will honestly confess to you, that I do not understand, nor believe, in the *abstract reception* of the Holy Spirit, so much spoken of, and preached in the world.

One party preaches that the Spirit enters into men and women of the world, and gives them power to believe and obey the written word of God.

Another party preaches that men and women have power, independent of the Spirit, to believe and obey the written word; but that, after they have believed and obeyed the word, then they receive the Holy Spirit.

To me, both these positions appear equally mystical, and both alike render the Scriptures useless. If the first position be true, the Scriptures are of no use to any but such as have received the Spirit, to enable them to understand and believe; therefore, their understanding and belief of the Scriptures depend upon the Spirit, and not upon the Scriptures. This view renders the Scriptures useless—a dead letter—and all translations of the Scriptures mere folly.

If the second position be true, either the Spirit or the written word is useless. If we can learn God's will from the Scriptures, and can

do it, independent of the Spirit, of what use is the Spirit, seeing that he teaches nothing, nor does he help our understanding in relation to God's will; for that we can learn from the words of the record? And we are as much dependent on the record for our knowledge of God's will after we obey the gospel as we were before. All we know of God we learn from the record.

This view renders the Spirit useless. And if the Spirit be received by us now, as he was by the Apostles and others in the last days of the Jewish polity (from Pentecost to the destruction of Jerusalem) then the Scriptures, or that part called the New Testament, would be useless to those who received the Spirit. For it was by the Spirit (received by the Apostles and others) that the words of the New Testament were spoken, and to them the New Testament would have been useless, for they were taught by its author.

Is it not, then, superstition in us to say that we are in possession of the author, and at the same time to acknowledge that we receive all our knowledge from his works? Those who were in possession of the author no more received their knowledge from his works than Luther, Calvin, and Wesley received what they have written from their own works. You receive the words of this manuscript from the manuscript itself; but I did not. I receive your words from your writings; but you did not.

I think, from what I have said, you can understand my difficulty; and if you can give me any light on the subject, do so, and you shall receive my thanks.

Yours as ever, M. WINANS.

☞I flatter myself that such difficulties as the above will be removed when we have ascertained the true and scriptural import of the sacred dialect. If it be not, we shall give it a specific answer.

Ed. M. H.

A Popular Sophism.

JAMESTOWN, *Ohio*, May 12, 1834.

Dear brother Campbell,

I HAVE recently noticed an odd kind of argument, which is prevalent in the world, to prove doctrine to be true or false. The doctrine is supposed to be true, if it be believed by good men; and to be false, if it be believed by bad man—just as though men could change truth into a lie, or a lie into truth, by believing it. Truth is truth whether it be believed or not. The belief of it does not make it truth, nor does the disbelief of it make it a lie. But men have put the cart before the horse in this as well as in other matters. Nothing is more common than to prove the truth of a doctrine by the number or quality of its believers, or to prove a doctrine false by the bad qualities of its believers.

Thus: If a man have professed to believe a doctrine, and steals a horse, or robs a man, this goes to prove the doctrine false; or if one

profess to believe a doctrine, and is afterwards a good citizen, this goes to prove the doctrine true. If he be a very pious man, his piety goes to prove the doctrine he professes to be true almost to demonstration.

Absurd as this reasoning is, still it passes currently in the world, and is frequently used by men who make high pretensions—by men who profess grammar, logic, and rhetoric.

By this argument it would be easy to prove that Jesus was an impostor—because the devils believed him to be the Son of God.

This argument is now one of the stumbling blocks thrown in the way of this reformation by its opposers. 'The doctrine,' say they, 'cannot be true, because those who believe it are not so good men as are among the Presbyterians, or among the Methodists, or among the Regular Baptists. At any rate, say they, if they are as good men, there are not so many good men belonging to the reformation as there are who belong to Presbyterians, Methodists, and Baptists.' And, by way of confirmation, they say, '*Campbell*, one of the main advocates of the doctrine, has no religion.' This is conclusive evidence with them that the doctrine is false.

By such arguments as this, and by strong assertions, do they oppose the truth. But all these, when brought in contact with truth, will be like the Egyptian's rods when brought in contact with Moses' rod. But the magicians of this age have learned something from what is written. They avoid contact—they use those arguments and assertions, and take care that none shall speak to the people who would be likely to sift their sophisms. And the written productions of any one who exposes error and sifts sophisms, cannot gain admission into any of the periodicals, any more than such proclaimers can gain admission into their meeting-houses.

But this is natural, or is taught in the visible creation. If any one desire darkness rather than light, he will shut all the doors and windows in his house to exclude the light.

Yours as ever,

M. WINANS.

Three Recent Evidences

Of the Decline of the Reformation, nicknamed "Campbellism" in Kentucky.

I. BLOOMFIELD was the focus of opposition to reformation in the days of the *Baptist Recorder*, and during the residence and editorial career of the late Mr. Clack. He was for a time the Editor of the Recorder (got up in opposition to the reformation) and the Pastor of the church there. The Recorder is long since extinct; and our last mail's advices informs us that the Baptist church of Bloomfield, aided and abetted by "the Rev. J. P. Wilson," recently compelled *seventy* of its white members to come out from among them, and constitute a church on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets.

II. Georgetown next became the focus of opposition to reformation. There, from the ashes of the Recorder, arose that admirable Phenix, the "*Baptist Chronicle*," under the inspection of *Uriel*, not Milton's Uriel nor Raphael, but

Uriel B. Chambers. This, "*like angels' visits, short and long between,*" soon vanished from our sight, and Uriel was next found in Frankfort, fighting under "the Cross and Banner," (an angelic name for a newspaper devoted to every miscellanea of slander and anecdote.) Frankfort, the seat of state and religious politics, the residence of the heads of all departments, though itself at the foot of all the hills of Kentucky, did not long love the *Cross and Banner*, nor idolize the genii of the opposition.

Uriel & his Cross finding no resting place, either in Frankfort or in all the land of Kentucky, next winged his way across the Ohio to Cincinnati, and accosting "the Baptist Weekly Journal" of Ohio, said, "Cast in thy lot with me—let us both have one purse." The Baptist Weekly, weakened in its vital energies, formed a contract, in which it was stipulated that the *Cross* should add to its escutcheon "the Baptist Journal," and that Johnson and Uriel should be *joint publishers and proprietors*, and J. Stevens *Editor*. Thus Kentucky has been delivered from the Recorder, the Baptist Chronicle, the Cross and Banner, and Uriel B. Chambers.

III. But even the *Georgetown College* Uriel says is contaminated since his departure. But we shall allow him to Chronicle its history in his own manner. Our readers, acquainted with this quondam editor, now half publisher of the Ohio "Cross and Baptist Journal," will know how much to subtract from the following letter, taken from its pages, under date of June 6, and what rebate and discount to make on his assertions:—

CINCINNATI, *Ohio*, May 30, 1834.

Brother Stevens,

IN the Cross and Journal, dated May 23d, you have given an extract from the "Kentucky Sentinel," relative to "Georgetown College, Ky." which, upon inquiry you will find, furnishes but a partial view of its concerns as a BAPTIST INSTITUTION. The session is represented as being opened with "the most flattering prospects,"—"between 30 and 40 pupils assembled," &c. This was, no doubt, intended to *sound* well in the public journals. But the *whole* truth should, and must, be known. It would, perhaps, somewhat vary the impression left upon the minds of some of your readers, if it were known that "T. F. Johnson," who has charge of "the department of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy," and "Dr. S. Hatch," who "occupies the chair of Chemistry," are decidedly "Reformers," so called, or Campbellites, and that "Mr. L. Lusk," who "has charge of the Grammar School," has, for years past, been an elder in Mr. Barton W. Stone's church. It might also be interesting to some to know that several of the Trustees are Campbellites,—that they were Baptists when they were appointed, but having since changed their religious views, now refuse to give place to others. It might also form an item of news to some, to be informed that the Treasurer, not long since appointed to the institution, is Clerk in the Post-Office for John T. Johnson, who is a member of the board, and a Campbellite preacher—and that, by a late order of the board, a requisition has been made on Dr. Noel, (who declines being President of the Institution,) to deposite the Pawling fund, with this Treasurer, and, as I am informed by high authority, with the avowed intention of applying the proceeds to the payment of the teachers engaged in common education—a fund set apart by Mr. Pawling, in his will, the founder of the institution, for the purpose only of educating poor ministers of the gospel of the

Baptist denomination—that Dr. Noel is advised by many of his Baptist friends, who are neither "Particulars," nor "Campbellites," not to obey the order; and that, therefore, a suit, on this subject, is talked of, if he should refuse. It might also constitute another item of intelligence to some, to be informed, that, at a late meeting of the board, the institution was let down from a college to a classical school, and that this is the ground it now occupies. These, with other kindred facts, may not be considered unimportant by some, in the history of the institution. And as I am collecting materials occasionally, of an interesting character, relative to our denomination, it may be reasonably presumed that this subject will not be wholly overlooked. Further developments, founded on documents and facts, if Providence permit, may be expected not long hence, "nothing extenuating, nor setting down aught in malice." In the mean time these suggestions may serve to counterbalance erroneous impressions.

As ever, yours, affectionately,

URIEL B. CHAMBERS.

So it appears, our opponents themselves being witness, that Kentucky is, in fact, without a Baptist College, without an Editor and a Journal in favor of the opposition to reform. Cannot some of the New England Missionaries erect a new Banner in that deserted land in favor of baptized Calvinism, either of the old school or of the new? *Ed. M. H.*

Co-operation.---Contribution for the Gospel.

NO. I.

PITTSBURG, June 6, 1834.

Brother Campbell,

I WOULD wish, through the medium of the *Harbinger*, to call the attention of the saints of Jesus Christ to a subject which of late has become a matter of great importance: The subject is that of *proclaimers*. It has been a matter of doubt with some, whether we are authorized by the word of God to send out persons to proclaim the gospel at the support of the congregations. To this, therefore, we would direct your attention. Christianity in its primeval state was altogether different from what it is at the present time. At that time they had not the word of God, neither had the glad tidings been proclaimed: hence the Saviour gives the command, "Go ye into *all* the world and preach the gospel to *every* creature," &c.—and as the salvation of their fellow-men was their greatest concern, it was necessary that, as all their time was taken up in this manner, they should be supported. But the case is quite different now. The word has been proclaimed, and churches have been established. It is now the business of the brethren to keep them in order. Some say there is as much need now as there was then of the word being proclaimed. True, in many places there is great need of it; but who are authorized at the present time to uphold the word? Is it the congregations or individuals only? Let us examine: In the first ages, as there was no churches, it must have been the *Apostles;* but at present it appears

evident that it is the *church*. Peter, in his first general epistle to the churches, says, (chap. ii. ver. 9.) "But *ye* are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people; that *ye might declare* the perfections of him who hath called you from darkness into his marvellous light." Hence we see it is the church that is to declare his perfections. It may be said, then, that it is in the power of the church to send out persons to proclaim the word; but we have no command to that effect. It may be said that in some places there are no churches, and that there ought to be some persons to establish them; but at the present time there are persons in the congregations who are able and who have the means of going to such places; or, indeed, if they feel concerned for their fellow-men, they can support themselves as they go along: for if they are so willing to take the Apostles for an example in other things, let them do it in this also; for the Apostle, although he had a right to be supported, yet he *labored with his own hands* that he might support himself and have to give unto others, which he says he did for *an example unto others:* and surely if the Apostle could support himself in those days, *we* can find means of supporting ourselves in the present day. Was this done, we would have no need of *co-operation* meetings to *employ* persons—they would employ *themselves*—would willingly enlist themselves at their own expense. And why is this plan not taken? The fact is this: The brethren have become too much engrossed in worldly business—have neglected the churches—and think it better to *employ* persons than to attend to it themselves. Let us examine these things impartially and conform to the word of God in regard to it, in order that we may act well pleasing in the sight of God.

TIMOTHY.

Reply to Timothy.

Brother Timothy,

IF Jesus Christ, in his wisdom, had decreed that a written document was the best means of converting the world, it would have been certainly the cheapest and most direct means to that end to have ordered his Apostles to write out such a document, and command the publication of it in numerous copies, and then to have bound all mankind under the highest penalties simply to read it. But he did not do so. He chose the human *tongue*, and gave new powers of speech to those whom he commanded to publish it. They afterwards made a record of their transactions, and gave the whole document into the care and keeping of the church. These Apostles first *spoke* and then *wrote* the New Institution. They selected from among the congregations certain fellow-laborers, and gave commandment to their co-operators to choose faithful and talented men, to whom they were to give in charge what they had received from them.

When the Apostles had set in order the Christian temple they died. The Lord sent no successors to them in office. The church, the whole church, was thus constituted one great converting institution. They had for this purpose all the Oracles, Jewish and Christian, be-

stowed on them—all the ordinances of Christ, with his Spirit dwelling in them—and the examples of the Apostles and Prophets to guide them in the great work of converting the world, and of working out their own salvation.

The powers of conversion which are bestowed upon the church are comprehended in two words—*the living oracles* and *the behaviour of the disciples*. Neither of them is complete without the other. Neither *the word* alone, nor *the behaviour* alone constitutes an efficient means of conversion; but, combined, they are all-sufficient and alone sufficient.

The church, viewed in this light, is not one congregation or assembly, but *the congregation of Christ*, composed of all the individual congregations on earth. In this work of conversion the whole church, by natural necessity, as well as by the authority of the great King, must co-operate.

The primitive congregations communicated jointly and co-operated in every thing that was beyond the power of a single congregation—in prayers, in counsel, in labor, in giving and receiving. There can be no Christian co-operation in one of these that does not suppose a co-operation in all. To pray for any thing for which we will not take counsel together, for which we will not jointly labor, for which we will not contribute with all our energies and means, is only mocking God and disappointing ourselves.*

You say, "The word has been proclaimed and churches have been established." True, very true; and just as true the word is still proclaiming, and churches are daily establishing, and so it must continue till the end, or till the candlesticks stand so close as to mingle their rays and diffuse light over every spot of earth or sea where dwells a son of Adam.

If all the members of one church can speak the word and fill up the whole measure of their relative duties to themselves, their families, their own congregation, and the world, it is well, very well; but if another church cannot do all this, they must be helped; and what shall become of the districts in which there is no congregation? Are not our Christian sympathies to reach them? Have we a brother that we can send, and shall we not send him? Or shall we send them a *church?* We speak of the church doing this—*not the world and the church combined, but the church herself.*

"Who are authorized at the present time to hold forth the word where it is not?" The church is to be *the salt*, the saviour of the world? Is this too strong language? Be it so. The church is to be the *candlestick*. Is this too figurative? Her messengers, then, are to

*A beggar once asked alms from a very rich Pharisee. He refused. "I only ask for a shilling," said the poor old man. "I cannot give it, sir." "A penny, then, sir, if you please." "No, sir." "Your prayers, then." "Yes! O yes!" replied the Pharisee. "I have no faith in them," said the beggar; "if they were worth *a penny* you would not give them." Such are the prayers for the poor and the conversion of the world, which we too often hear in our Christian synagogues—*not worth a penny!*

be *stars?* But this, you say, is also too figurative. Well, she is to be *the light* of the world. But this was spoken to the disciples *en masse.* What remains? From the church is "to sound forth the word of the Lord." But how is it to sound? The church always had authority to use her own members for whatever service they were qualified. She makes a bishop out of one, a deacon out of another, a messenger out of a third; and of this messenger she makes a preacher, an exhorter, a letter-carrier, or an almoner, as the case may require.

But she must sustain him in the work, else he is not her servant, her messenger. A volunteer he may be; but if he costs her nothing, he brings her nothing. If he bears his own charges, the credit in the book of God's remembrance is placed to his individual account, not to that of the church. God's book of remembrance, my good brother, is without an error.

But you concede every thing I have yet affirmed—that the church is bound to declare the perfections of him who has called her from darkness to light. The only difficulty with you appears to be the sending and sustaining of these persons. You want a broad precept, or an approved precedent.

We have the very same broad precept and approved precedent which authorized the church of Antioch to send messengers to Jerusalem, and which authorized them to convert Paul and Barnabas into messengers, and to make them their ministers for the time being: for mind me, Paul and Barnabas did neither nominate nor elect themselves, but the church appointed them to serve their purposes. How arrogant was the church in Antioch to presume to make one of Christ's Apostles, together with certain others of their own number, her messengers, and to send Paul to do their business—if the Apostles had not taught the church that her head was Christ, and that he had given this power to his body to use its arms and feet, its eyes and ears, its lips and tongue like any other body? Do you think, my good brother, that the church of Jesus Christ is a *marble statue*, which cannot move one of its own fingers? or a *metallic bust*, which has no power of locomotion, and no feet to carry it? But the church of Antioch *assumed* this power of making messengers, or she *learned* it from the mother church in Jerusalem. Take either side of the dilemma, and we have authority to go and do likewise!

We will, then, assume it, because the church in Antioch first assumed it, and the Apostles countenanced it; or we will practise it, because Jerusalem, the mother of all commanded it.

You must read from the 24th verse of the 14th, to the end of the 5th verse of the 15th chapters of Luke's ecclesiastical history, called the transactions of the Apostles, to find out the beginning of this business of sending out missionaries on the part of churches. I mean, such a beginning of it as suits your difficulties; for you will often find this matter alluded to or spoken of in the Epistles. You will find all the Roman Empire peregrinated by itinerant preachers and fellow-laborers of the Apostles—by messengers of congregations, with letters of

commendation in their pockets, who were the glory of Christ, and a demonstration of the zeal and purity of the brethren in all the congregations that sent them. I say, to find such an account of this matter as just suits the two questions, *What church has a right to send out any itinerant?* and *Who is to support him?* you will please weigh every word in the section before us.

You will easily discover that the moment you concede the right to a single congregation to send out one messenger, you then find authority and obligation *to bring him forward on his journey by the contributions of his brethren.* When God sends missionaries he sustains them, and will feed and clothe them as he pleases. The church must do so with her missionaries. Examine the 3d verse of the 15th chapter, and you will find that this Antiochan church, that *assumed* to elect, commission, and send her own members, and those who were only members *pro tem.* to act for her, because she could not without greater expense go herself, did actually *bear the expences of the whole mission.* For "Paul, Barnabas, and some others of their number," were "*brought forward on their journey by the* CONGREGATION."

They were well received by the brethren in Jerusalem, not merely as brethren, but as *the ministers* of the congregation in Antioch; and as such were recognized by all the Apostles and the elders of the metropolitan church.

It will not suit our convenience to prosecute this matter farther at present. You may expect something more to the same effect. It is a great pity that so many liberal-minded churches, who are anxious to spread the influences of Christianity from pole to pole, who have talented brethren and the means of supporting them, and who are willing to contribute, should be so straitened in their own bowels as not to feel that God has put it in their power thus to lay up treasure in heaven, to turn many to righteousness, and by the means bestowed upon them to save many of their contemporaries from their sins.

There is a way, however, of searching the Scriptures for authority for certain matters, and we may be sure we shall never find it. If any one was to seek authority for building a house to meet in, or for printing, translating, and publishing the Bible, Old Testament or New, he would never find it, if he expect to find it in the form of the ten commandments, or in the way that Moses reared the tabernacle, or David built the temple. There is, however, authority in the New Testament for building a meeting house, for translating, printing, and publishing the Scriptures, for sending out persons to preach the word, for supporting them in the work, and for every thing necessary to the comfort and edification of the church and the conversion of the whole world. But we will not find it on two tables of stone, nor in the form of the ten commandments.

EDITOR.

Conversations in Father Goodal's Family Circle, at Mr. Reed's.

Table-Talk at Supper.

Mr. Reed. PERHAPS we had better postpone, Mr. Williamson, your difficulties about the *Two Witnesses* till after supper.

Mr. Williamson. One employment at a time, Mr. Reed. We Americans think that a man cannot reason and eat at the same time, and therefore we do not generally attempt to act the philosopher at table. At our meals we all recollect that the great philosopher Aristotle himself proved, by a regular syllogism, that although every animal is not a *man*, yet every man is an *animal*. The table for *animal enjoyments*, and the fireside for *intellectual*, is my motto.

Mr. Payne. Our medical philosophers tell us that it is bad philosophy to attempt to divide the physical forces between the brain and the stomach. If, say they, you draw upon the brain, the brain must draw upon the stomach; how, then, can the stomach perform its functions while you abstract its nervous energies to aid the brain?

Mr. Williamson. I am for concentrating all the forces, *a la mode Napoleon;* therefore, the philosophical application of my knife and fork, according to the most approved discoveries in mechanical science, is as much abstract thinking as my stomach will bear during the time of eating. The pleasures of the table are very sensible pleasures, and with me it is sound philosophy to derive as much pleasure as possible from every source; and therefore, from one source at a time.

Mr. Reed. But is not too much despatch as detrimental to the pleasures of sense as it is to health?

Mr. Payne. So our English epicures affirm, and therefore the pleasures of the table are increased by being protracted, so that we are likely in a short time to equal the Parisians themselves in protracted dinners.

Mr. Williamson. This, Mr. Payne, may suit the nobility and gentry of England and France; but while we Americans agree with them that there is much pleasure in good eating and drinking, and that we have a natural and indefeasible right to derive pleasure from every source which God and nature have opened to us; yet our industrious habits, inherited from our fathers, who had to encounter the wilderness and reclaim immense forests and wilds of nature to make some reasonable provision for themselves and their children, have caused us to handle the knife and fork with the rapidity of the axe or saw of the woodcutter. I have seen fifty men in a New York Hotel sit down to a table covered with all the good things of land and sea, and in *ten minutes* the dishes were eased of their burthens and their contents moving to and fro in all directions through the city.

Mr. Payne. Our English physicians (and we strongly incline to their theory in this matter) say, that the reason why dyspepsia is more common in England than in France, is not in the superior stamina of French constitution, nor in the more congenial aliments of nature, either grown in France or imported into it, nor in the superior salubrity of its climate, but in the habits of eating and drinking which obtain in the two countries. By spending time in eating, the Frenchman either gains physical power or retains the physical energies of his stomach; whereas the Englishman loses power by gaining time, in accordance with the well established laws of mechanics. So that our epicures say they have all science and experience too on their side of the question.

Father Goodal. It is easy to misapply the wisest maxims and rules of experience, and while apparently guarding against one extreme, to run into the opposite. Hence in avoiding dyspepsia, it seems that many degenerate into epicurism. We must all admit that the sudden distension of the stomach by the rapid ingestion of a full meal, must soon injure its tone and impair all its

powers of assimilation; besides, in this hurried deglutition one feels not that he has eaten enough till he have eaten too much. One thing, indeed, my experience fully sustains, that if we could spend double the time in eating the same quantity, it would greatly tend to the preservation of our physical energies. Few, however, can manage this point: for in protracting the time of eating, they unintentionally increase the quantity. He that has been accustomed to eat ten ounces in ten minutes, will be apt to eat twelve or fifteen if he attempt to eat for twenty minutes. To eat by weight for a few meals would soon convince one how difficult it is to prolong the time on the same quantity. Every person of a weak stomach, who will make the experiment, and double the time of eating the same quantity, will in a short time discover a material improvement in health; and if he reduce the quantity, say one-fourth, while he doubles the time, my experience justifies me in saying he will need but little physic.

Mr. Williamson. Father Goodal, are you not too abstemious? You seem to eat as if it were the performance of a duty you owe yourself, rather than a gratification and a pleasure which was to be enjoyed as one of the kind bounties of nature. Do we not sing in all churches,

> *"Religion never was design'd*
> *To make our pleasures less"?*

Father Goodal. Nay, indeed, it makes our pleasures *more*. Duty and pleasure are, Mr. Williamson, with me inseparable. I find no pleasure where there is no duty—and no duty without pleasure. If I am thirsty, it is my duty to drink. Is it not a pleasure, too, to slake one's thirst at the cool limpid spring? If I can quench my thirst better by drinking one half pint in one minute, than by drinking a pint in half a minute, have I not more pleasure and greater safety in discharging this duty according to reason, than in irrationally, or rather instinctively, yielding to appetite. By these means my taste is as good now as it was forty years ago; and though my eyes are somewhat dim, yet the beauties of nature are as vivid and attracting as ever. I still derive pleasure from a thousand springs.

Mr. Williamson. Are no duties painful? I had thought that religion inculcated penances and crosses, self-denial and abstinence, to such a degree as to make it, at least in some respects, irksome to flesh and blood. One reason why I have never made a public profession of religion, has been my fears of inability to comply with all its penances and self-denying impositions which I have been taught to regard as opposed to physical enjoyment at least.

Father Goodal. How do you reconcile this with your proof, just now quoted, that *"religion never was design'd to make our pleasures less"?*

Mr. Williamson. Truly—I appear like some preachers whom I have heard quote a verse to prove one point, which also proved another that they did not wish to have proved. I must, however, think those lines express a truth, because so current; yet I cannot reconcile them to what is written about the yoke of Christ, self-denial, and the cross. Is not self-denial a painful thing, Father Goodal?

Father Goodal. May not pleasure itself be derived from pain—at least from the pain of self-denial? Exercise is not rest, but it is essential to rest; and whatever happiness there is in rest comes from exercise. He that yields to his appetite, and swallows a large draught of cool water when heated under a scorching sun; and he that denies himself, and drinks but little, and with great caution, act very differently—and as different are the consequences of their actions. The former gratifies himself for the moment, but is convulsed, and in a few hours expires in great agony. The latter felt the pain of self-denial for a moment, but for years has derived pleasure from the exercise of it. The self-denial which Christ inculcates is of this sort: it is painful for the moment, but pleasurable forever. "His yoke is easy and his burthen light"—"His precepts are not grievous"—"And in keeping of his commandments there is a great reward"—"Wisdom's ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are paths of peace"—"The pleasures of sin are," as Paul says, "but for a moment."

The pain of self-denial is also but for a moment, but the consequences of both are eternal. This, you say, was the cause why you have never made a *public* profession of religion? Did you ever make a *private* profession?

Mr. Williamson. I am confounded. I thought that because I felt myself strongly inclined to religion, and delighted to understand and talk about it, and to make myself acquainted with all its leading questions, that I might be regarded as a sort of professor. But I feel that I have imposed upon myself in the use of the words *public profession.* I am convicted of my delinquency—I am not a confessor of Christ—indeed, I have never been classed with the people of God,

Father Goodal. I am pleased to see you so candid, friend Williamson, and to hear you reason so correctly. You say your consciousness of inability to comply with the impositions of the gospel, have hitherto prevented you from making a public profession. You perceive, and very correctly too, that while you have been talking about religious questions, and partially interested in its success, you nevertheless differ nothing from the peasantry of this country, who are always talking about your America, praising its institutions, and wishing they were American citizens; yet all the while they are groaning under the taxes and tithes of a limited monarchy in church and state; for they will not be translated to your country, and therefore cannot be naturalized citizens of the American family.

Mr. Williamson. This is precisely my situation; but what to do I know not. I can say, "Lord, I believe; help my unbelief." I would give the world to be a Christian!

Father Goodal. Give yourself to God. He asks you for nothing more!

Mr. Williamson. How can I give myself?

Father Goodal. Do what God bids you in that volume, [*pointing to a New Testament;*] acknowledge him, honor and obey him with all the powers he has given you.

Mr. Williamson. If I knew any thing that Jesus Christ bade me to do to obtain his favor, I would do it.

Father Goodal. Receive his favor—you cannot *buy* it. Without money or price you may have it!

Mr. Williamson. How?—where—when shall I receive it?

[At this moment Mr. Williamson retires, and all the guests are overwhelmed at the turn the conversation had taken. Maria Goodal is in tears. Mr. Reed follows him into another room, and the company rise from table.]

Mrs. Reed. I never seen Mr. Williamson so much agitated before.

Mrs. Fowler. In conversation he is often absent. There is a degree of restlessness and anxiety displayed in all his movements.

Father Goodal. Discovering this, was the reason why I spoke so emphatically on a *public profession;* but I did not, indeed, expect to pierce his heart so deeply by touching the subject so gently. Many are deceived by regarding themselves as Christians who have never put on Christ. Because they have some knowledge of the Bible, go to meeting, comply with certain Christian usages, and delight to be skilled in various questions, they conclude that they belong to the fold of Christ. I have found this notion inimical—I might add, ruinous to the best interests of many of my acquaintance. Through some means or other the land-marks are broken down. In old times there was a marked difference between a Christian, a Jew, a Gentile. God's people were always easily distinguished from every other people. Not so in my day. There seems to be so near and so gradual an approximation in sentiment and moral behaviour to Christianity, that, in numerous instances, neither I nor they can tell whether or not they belong to the family of God. To have listened to our friend Williamson speaking on various Christian subjects, and to observe the interest he has taken in the whole matter since his appearance amongst us, who would not have regarded him as a Christian? There appeared to me, indeed, occasionally something wanting; but at other times I could not give it a name.

Mrs. Fowler. I saw, or thought I saw, in Mr. Williamson, a lurking distrust or

want of confidence in Jesus Christ. He appeared like a very friendly alien. Confidence in himself, and a corresponding affection for our Saviour, seemed to me wanting.

Mrs. Reed. I confess I can see this now, but I could not so clearly discern it before. How many thousands are there who consider themselves, and are considered good Christians, whose intelligence, moral demeanor, and attention to the Bible are not to be compared with the attainments of Mr. Williamson!

Father Goodal. True, very true. But these attainments make not a Christian. There is a practical knowledge of Jesus Christ, an intimacy with him, a confidence in him, a devotion to him, an assurance of acceptance with God by him, an ardent affection for his cause and people, which it is hard to counterfeit; and this wanting, all the rest is but a sounding brass—a tinkling cymbal.

Mrs. Fowler. But how many put on Christ by openly confessing him before the world, in whom these things are as palpably wanting as in Mr. Williamson!

Father Goodal. This we all concede. But still, all who have confidence in Christ will acknowledge him—will put him on. All who profess do not possess; but all who possess will profess. My observation through life amply sustains the truth of these two propositions. I never knew a *possessor* of Christ that was not a *professor;* but I have known many professors who were not possessors. Profession follows possession as naturally as works follow faith—as necessarily as light emanates from the sun.

Mr. Payne. I would thank Mr. Goodal to define what he means by making a profession of religion.

Father Goodal. I mean making a public avowal of faith in Christ, and a declaration of allegiance to him as the rightful sovereign of the human heart, and only saviour of sinners.

Mr. Payne. How is this done?

Father Goodal. In *old* times it was done by a confession of a belief in Jesus as the Messiah, and baptism.

Mr. Payne. And what was the meaning of baptism?

Father Goodal. It was a putting on of Christ as the Messiah of God, and assuming the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost. In a word, it was putting oneself under the authority of Jesus in all his official relations, and uniting with all who acknowledge him in the bonds of love as brethren in Christ.*

Mr. Payne. And what is the present mode?—(But here enters Mr. Reed.)

EDITOR.

Catholic Controversy---No. 6.

IN tracing the footsteps of these combatants on the field of controversy, we occasionally discern such effusions of blood as assure us that many deep wounds have been inflicted by the belligerents on each other. The Protestant seems almost to have pierced to the heart his Catholic antagonist on the subject of his pretensions to an infallible arbiter in settling the meaning of Scripture, by arguing from the concessions of distinguished writers and pleaders for the Roman Hierarchy. They have, in the straitness and severity of controversy, been compelled to acknowledge that every man must use the Protestant rule of interpretation, or, as they call it, "rule of faith," in finding out the marks of the true church—in deciding whether the Catholic or

* *Father Goodal lived before this institution was restored in its primitive import to the church.*

any other sect be the true church of God. I say, the Catholics of note, to a man, are compelled to allow this; but, say they, after he has found the Catholic church to be the true church, he has no more use for the Protestant rule of faith. But this concession is an incurable wound to Popery: for if, says the Protestant, he can interpret, and must, from the necessity of the case, interpret the Scriptures for himself in settling the greatest of all questions; of what use is the Catholic rule in settling the less? As he must begin with the Protestant rule and work by it till he have found salvation, why then throw this rule aside, and accept for it a rule by which he never could have found salvation?

As it will be gratifying to the reader to see the Catholic routed on this point, we shall here introduce the Protestant, with his extracts from Cardinal Bellarmine, and his comments upon them:—

"Bellarmine also thus writes:—'We say, therefore, that the marks of the church which we shall adduce do not plainly (or of themselves) constitute the evidence of truth, because otherwise it would not be an article of faith *that such a church is the true church*, nor could any persons be found who would deny that article, just as no person can be found who will deny the points which the mathematicians demonstrate. Yet they (the marks of the church) constitute the *evidence of credibility* according to the 92d Psalm: "*Thy testimonies are very credible*." But among those who admit the divine Scriptures and histories, and the writings of the ancient Fathers, they constitute the evidence of truth. For although the truth of the articles of faith is not *absolutely* evident, yet it is evident *by hypothesis*, that is, the truth of the Scriptures being admitted; for *whatever is evidently deduced from the Scriptures*, is evidently true, the Scriptures being admitted. chap. 3. book 4. concerning the marks of the church.'

"Such are the admissions of your standard writers. Then it is acknowledged, that the marks of the true church are not self-evident, but that the proofs of them must be *deduced from the sacred Scriptures*. It is also acknowledged that there is *one subject* on which *private judgment* must be exercised, viz. *In finding out from the word of God the marks of the true church. All the passages* of the word of God, then, that go to show which is the true church, are to be judged by private judgment. There are fifteen marks of a true church mentioned by Bellarmine, viz. 1. "The name Catholic. 2. Antiquity. 3. Duration. 4. Amplitude of Believers. 5. The succession of Bishops. 6. Agreement in doctrine with the primitive church 7. Union of the members among themselves and with the Head. 8. Sanctity of doctrine. 9. Efficacy of the doctrine. 10. Holiness of life. 11. The glory of miracles. 12. The light of prophecy. 13. Confession of adversaries. 14. The unhappy end of the church's enemies. 15. Temporal felicity." These marks must be found out, before you know whether the Greek, or Episcopal, or Roman, or Presbyterian, or any other church, be the true church. But a very large amount of Scripture is to be interpreted in order *to find* the true church. For example, to make out the 6th mark, a

man must know what the doctrines of the primitive church were, (in a word, must know the whole word of God,) before he can compare its doctrines with those of the churches now existing.

"So, too, in finding the 8th mark, "sanctity of doctrine." Bellarmine tells us, "The church is said to be holy, because its profession contains nothing false as to doctrine of faith, nothing unjust as to doctrine of morals." It is true Dr. Milner says, (as quoted above,) "These marks of the church are so plain in themselves, and so evidently pointed out, that fools cannot err in their road to it." But when you come to examine the proofs which are brought from the Scripture, they will be found as a whole to be less clear than the body of Scripture is, and far less so than those portions of the word of God on which fundamental doctrines and practical duties rest.

"If *private interpretation* is ruinous in the use of all other Scripture, why is it not ruinous here? If *private interpretation* is sufficient to explore the whole word of God, in order to find out the true church, why is it not sufficient for the rest? And if truth stands out as clear as the mountain tops, so that the fool cannot err, in whatever relates to the church, how does it become suddenly and impenetrably dark in all things relating to Jesus and salvation, to sin, and holiness, to all doctrine, and all duty? If *private interpretation* may, with moral certainty, and indisputable credibility, lay the foundation of your whole system, why may it not avail for the whole volume of truth, and the whole catalogue of doctrine? Here, then, by the admission of your own writers, *private interpretation* is the only guide in a search after salvation, and all the articles of faith; for you say, there is no salvation out of the true church, and the true church alone teaches infallibly the articles of faith; and private interpretation must find out the true church! Is not this, then, a ruinous chasm; a palpable contradiction; a most disingenuous and deceitful argument?

"It may simplify and enforce the above remarks to give the following dialogue between a Romanist and a Protestant, extracted from an able work on the subject of infallibility:—

'*Papist.* I pity your condition, sir, to see you live at such uncertainties for your religion, and obstinately refuse to consult that living oracle and infallible judge, whom God hath placed in his church, to decide all controversies in faith and worship.

'*Protestant.* Sir, I thank you for your charity; and though I do not find myself so uncertain as I perceive you think I am, yet I should be glad af such an infallible guide as you talk of, if I knew where to find him.

'*Papist.* He is to be found in the church of Rome; for that is the church which is the pillar and ground of the truth; there is St. Peter's chair, whom Christ made the supreme governor of his church, whom he commanded to feed his lambs and his sheep; that rock on whom Christ promised to build his church, and that the gates of hell should not prevail against it; and, therefore, in communion with this church, and in obedience to the supreme pastor of it, you cannot err.

'*Protestant.* But pray how shall I be sure of this?

'*Papist.* Do you ask that now, when I have referred you to such plain texts of Scripture for the proof of it?

'*Protestant.* Will you allow me, then, to interpret these texts according to my own private judgment? And why, then, may I not use my judgment in other matters? for I think all the articles of my creed are as plain in Scripture, as that the Pope or Church of Rome is the supreme infallible judge; and, indeed, I must stand to my own judgment in this matter, I can find no such thing in these texts as you have alleged.

'*Papist.* Your own judgment! No, by no means; this causes all the heresies in the world—that men will presume to judge for themselves.

'*Protestant.* What course must I take then?

'*Papist.* You must stand to the judgment of the church, which cannot err; and whatever heretics say, she will tell you, that these texts prove the church's infallibility.

'*Protestant.* Hold, sir; what is it we are to prove?

'*Papist.* That the church is infallible.

'*Protestant.* And this I must prove from Scripture?

'*Papist.* Yes.

'*Protestant.* And must not rely on *my own judgment* for the sense of Scripture, but on the interpretation of the church?

'*Papist.* Right; this is the true Catholic way.

'*Protestant.* That is, I must take the church's word that she is infallible?

'*Papist.* No; you must believe the Scriptures, which say so.

'*Protestant.* But I must believe the Scripture, not because I understand this to be the sense of it, but because the church so expounds it?

'*Papist.* Right, for heretics expound it otherwise.

'*Protestant.* And what is it, then, *but to take the church's word for her own infallibility; to believe it because she says it herself, or to believe it because she makes the Scripture say it? And so, then, you can never be infallibly certain of your church's infallibility; and of course you can never be infallibly certain that its teaching is true.*— Then, as to any doctrine, *say the divinity of Christ*, Protestants believe it, because the inspired word of God, in its plain and obvious sense, clearly teaches it. Papists believe it because the church says so—and they believe the church to be infallible because they think the plain and obvious sense of Scripture teaches it. In a word, the faith of the Protestant is resolved into the infallibility of Christ and his Apostles; whereas the faith of Papists is resolved into the infallibility of Popes and councils. "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge thou!" Peter, Acts iv. 19.

Mr. Breckinridge is triumphant on this point; and on the following he is equally successful. Luther had somewhere said that "the church [meaning the true church] had never burned a heretic." *That the true church never was a persecutor, but always persecuted*, is with me an axiom in ecclesiastic history. That persecution is essential to

Popery—*a necessary ingredient in the system*—is ably proved by Mr. Breckinridge on sundry occasions; but no where more unanswerably than in the following extract:—

"And here I refer to your own Bellarmine, who (as you informed me) is a standard writer with you, who was the nephew of a Pope (Marcellus II.) was a cardinal in the church; and, above all, whose works received the sanction of the Pope. I extract parts of the 21st and 22d chapters of his 3d book on the laity:—

'CHAP. XXI.—*That heretics condemned by the church may be punished with temporal penalties, and even with death.* We will briefly show that the church has the *power, and it is her duty*, to cast off incorrigible heretics, especially those who have relapsed, and that the secular power ought to inflict on such temporal punishments, and even death itself. 1st. This may be proved from the Scriptures. 2d. It is proved from the opinions and laws of the Emperors, *which the church has always approved.* 3d. *It is proved by the laws of the church.* 4th. It is proved by the testimony of the fathers. Lastly, it is proved from natural reason. For, *first:* It is owned by all, that heretics may of right be excommunicated—of course they may be put to death. This consequence is proved because excommunication is greater punishment that temporal death. Secondly: *Experience proves that there is no other remedy;* for the church has step by step tried all remedies —first,—excommunication alone; then, pecuniary penalties; afterward, banishment; and lastly, *has been forced to put them to death—to send them to their own place. Thirdly:* All allow that forgery deserves death; but heretics are guilty of forgery of the word of God. *Fourthly:* A breach of faith by man toward God, is a greater sin, than of a wife with her husband. But a woman's unfaithfulness is punished with death; why not a heretic's? *Fifthly:* There are three grounds on which reason shows that heretics should be put to death: the first is, lest the wicked should injure the righteous—second, that by the punishment of a *few, many* may be reformed. FOR MANY WHO WERE MADE TORPID BY IMPUNITY, ARE ROUSED BY THE FEAR OF PUNISHMENT; AND THIS WE DAILY SEE IS THE RESULT WHERE THE INQUISITION FLOURISHES. *Finally:* It is a benefit to obstinate heretics to remove them from this life; for the longer they live the more errors they invent, the more persons they mislead, and the greater damnation do they treasure up to themselves.'

'CHAP. XXII.—*Objections Answered.*—It remains to answer the objections of Luther and other heretics. Argument 1st. *From* the history of the church at large. *The church*, says Luther, *from the beginning, even to this time, has never burned a heretic.* Therefore, it does not seem to be the mind of the Holy Spirit, that they should be burned! I reply, this argument admirably proves not the sentiment, but the ignorance, or impudence of Luther: FOR AS ALMOST AN INFINITE NUMBER WERE EITHER BURNED OR OTHERWISE PUT TO DEATH, Luther either did not know it, and was therefore *ignorant;* or if he knew it, he is convicted of impudence and falsehood—for *that heretics*

were often burned by the church may be proved by adducing a few from many examples.

'Argument 2d. *Experience shows that terror is not useful* (in such cases.) I reply, EXPERIENCE PROVES THE CONTRARY—FOR THE DONATISTS, MANICHEANS, AND ALBIGENSES WERE ROUTED, AND ANNIHILATED BY ARMS.

'Argument 13th. The Lord attributes to the church "*the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God;*" but not the material sword; nay, he said to Peter, who wished to defend him with a material sword, "*Put up thy sword into the scabbard.*" John xviii. I answer: As the church has ecclesiastical and secular princes, who are her two arms; so she has two swords, the spiritual and material; and therefore when her right hand is unable to convert a heretic with the sword of the Spirit, she invokes the aid of the left hand, and coerces heretics with the material sword!

'Argument 18th. The Apostles never invoked the secular arm against heretics. Answer, (according to St. Augustine, in letter 50, and elsewhere:) The Apostles did it not, because there was no Christian Prince whom they could call on for aid. But afterwards in Constantine's time,.....the church called in the aid of the secular arm.'

"The mere translation of these infamous passages discloses the very "mystery of iniquity" which for ages has been working in the church of Rome. Here we have the extraordinary fact, that the Old Testament and the New, the laws of the church, the testimony of the Fathers, the history of the Church, reason, the good of *other* men, and even *mercy* towards the unhappy victims, are all adduced in one cumulative argument to prove that the Church of Rome *has the authority, and that it is her duty to put to death men who differ incorrigibly from her in their doctrines!* You will hardly say, *these are opinions;* for here, we find, that he adduces, 1st. *ecclesiastical law!* Now can you say that the church did not burn these heretics, but that the civil power did it; for we see, second. that "the civil power," (as stated above,) "is one of the arms of the church, and its sword, one of the swords of the church;" and that "the church has always approved" the edicts and acts of emperors in this way; and "that heretics were often burned by the church!" Perhaps you have read the life of George Wishart, who was martyred by your Cardinal Beaton, of bloody memory. In it you will find that when the Cardinal failed to secure from the Regent the condemnation of Wishart for heresy, without a fair trial, he returned for answer, that he had sufficient authority to condemn heretics without the interposition of the civil power; and accordingly he actually tried, condemned, and burned Wishart, in despite of the distinct prohibition of the Regent of the country. 3d. This, your standard author, calls Luther a fool or a knave, for denying that the church had burned heretics. He says, "Almost an infinite number of heretics were burned by the church," and instances the Donatists, Manicheans, and Albigenses. 4th. He tells us that the only reason why the church did not burn heretics before Constantine, was, *that there was no prince who would do it;*—

but as soon as she could have it done, she did it. *Query*—Why is it not done in the United States? It is done in Spain! I beg Mr. Hughes to tell us why! 5th. And this is the *unchangeable church!* Of course she is the same *now* that she was *then*,—and would, if she could, do the same now she ever did. She does not lack the *will*, but the *power;* and wo to this land if that power be ever acquired!

'Illustration from History—Massacre of St. Bartholomew.

"Mezerai's History of France, fol. vol. 2. p. 1098. (Paris 1646.) During two months this horrible and cruel tempest overspread France, in some places more, and in some less, and destroyed not less than 25,000 persons. Davila, p. 275, says, The report constantly prevailed, that in the course of a few days not fewer than 40,000 of the Huguenots had perished.

"The Holy Father and all his Court displayed a great rejoicing, and went in solemn procession to the church of St. Louis, to render thanks to God for so happy a success.

"The following extracts from the letter of Pope Pius V. book 3. let. 45. incontestably proves that the massacre of St. Bartholomew owes its origin to the vindictive councils of the Popes:—'To our most dear son in Christ, Charles, the most Christian King of the French. The public joy of this city has very much augmented our pleasure, which at the first certain intelligence of so great a victory, rejoiced and does rejoice. The fruit of this victory consists in this, that by a just animadversion, the wicked heretics, the common enemies being removed out of the way, its former peace and tranquility may be restored to that kingdom.' Thuanus, in his History, book 53, tells us, that 'on the news of this massacre being received at Rome, it was instantly resolved that the Pope with the Cardinals should straightway go to to the church of St. Mark, and should solemnly return thanks to the Lord for so great a blessing conferred upon the Roman See and the Christian world, that thence a jubilee should be published in the whole Christian world. Its causes were declared to be, that they should return thanks to God for the destruction of the enemies of the truth and of the church in France,' &c. &c.

"Finally, Fleuri, in his Ecclesiastical History, vol. 23. book 173. p. 557. tells us, Gregory XIII. only regarding the good which he thought likely to result from this, to the Catholic religion in France, ordered a procession, in which he himself joined, from the church of St. Peter's to the church of St. Louis, to return thanks to God for so happy a result; and to perpetuate the memory of this event, he caused several medals to be struck, wherein he himself is represented on the one side, and on the other side an angel carrying a cross in one hand, and a sword in the other, exterminating the heretics.

"Allow me to add one item more to this delectable catalogue:—Among the extracts from Bellarmine given above, there is this distinct approval of the Inquisition: "WE DAILY SEE THE SAME RESULTS [viz. the good done in putting an end to heresy,] IN PLACES WHERE THE INQUISITION FLOURISHES." You are not a stranger, I suppose, to Jo-

annes Devotus. *His Institutions* have the highest sanctions of your Church at Rome itself, *as containing nothing contrary to faith or good morals.* Of course, his authority will not be questioned; and as his writings are of comparatively recent date, (1793,) they give us glances at the Roman Church in our own times. I omit the original, because so much has been already introduced. But it is open to your inspection, if you have it not in your possession, vol 4th, tit. 8th, page 101—118, under the head, "*Inquisitors of Heretical Pravity,*" he gives the following statements:—"The cause of instituting the tribunal, called the Inquisition, was this: At first every bishop in his own diocese, or a number of bishops assembled in a provincial council, made inquisition of those errors which arose in the diocese or province; but the more weighty matters were *always referred* to the apostolical seat [Rome:] and thus every bishop or provincial council took care to bring to its proper issue whatever was decreed by the Apostolical See. But in process of time, when greater evils pressed, it became necessary for the Pope to send legates into those regions in which heresy had long and widely spread, that they might assist the bishops in restraining the audacity of abandoned men, and in deterring Christians from foreign and depraved doctrines. But when new errors daily sprung up, and the number of heretics was greatly increased—seeing that the legates could not always be at hand, nor apply the proper remedy, it was determined to INSTITUTE A STANDING TRIBUNAL, that should always be present, *and at all times, and in every country,* should devote their minds to preserving the soundness of the faith, and to restraining and expelling heresies as they arose. Thus it was, that *the Inquisitors were first appointed to perform the office of Vicars to the Holy See.* But as in a matter so weighty as the preservation of the purity of the faith, *the Inquisitors* needed that close union of mind, and sentiment, which is proper to the Apostolical See, as the centre of unity, *there was instituted, at Rome, by the Popes, an assembly or congregation of Cardinals, in which the Pope presides. This congregation is the head of all Inquisitors, over the whole world; to it they all refer their more difficult matters; and its authority and judgment are final.* It is rightly and wisely ordered that the Pope's office and power should sustain this institution. For he is the centre of unity and head of the church: and to him Christ has committed plenary power to feed, teach, and govern all Christians. Now from this it appears, 1. That according to the government adopted at Rome, the Inquisition is a constituent part of their system;—and that it is established wherever they have such a foothold as to make it possible. Buchanan found one even at Goa, in the East Indies. Whether there be one in this country is *a matter of opinion.* But it is *sound doctrine* to have it if possible. 2. The Pope is the head of the Inquisition over the whole world—and the congregation of the Cardinals at Rome is the supreme court of the Inquisition; of course it is to the Pope, and his Cardinals, we are to look as the authors, originally, of the unparalleled enormities, which have characterized this bloodiest institution in the history of the world.

"Let me here give another word of history.

"A critical History of the Spanish Inquisition, by D. J. A. Llorente, formerly Secretary of the Inquisition, &c. &c. translated from the Spanish manuscript in the presence of the author, by Alexis Pellier. 2d edit. (Paris, 1818.)

"It is the Inquisition which has ruled in Spain from the year 1481 to the present day, of which I undertake to write the history, *Tom.* 1. p. 140.

"Recapitulation of all the victims condemned and burnt,	31,912
"Burned in effigy,	17,695
"Placed in a state of penance with rigorous punishments,	291,450
Total,	341,057"

"When the French obtained possession of Spain, under Joseph Bonaparte, Llorente obtained permission to examine all the archives of the Inquisition. His work, therefore, is the most authentic that is extant. When we come to speak of these subjects as principal, and not illustrative topics, we design, Providence permitting, to make such disclosures of its history as truth demands. But now let it suffice to say that this is the institution which Bellarmine praises as a fine method of settling disputes! On this plan we grant you that it is easy to "*determine disputes*" by putting an end to all the disputants on one side of the question. And now, sir, having at some length stated the methods used by the Church of Rome, I ask if the inference is not irresistable, that yours is a rule of fraud, and of force; abhorrent to right reason, mercy, and truth; and as such, that it is an insult to our holy religion to say it was instituted by Jesus Christ, or that yours is an infallible rule?"

All this is in accordance with the decrees of the infallible councils of the Roman church. The great Lateran Council, called by Pope Innocent, A. D. 1215, (present, 2 Patriarchs, 70 Metropolitans, 400 Bishops, 812 Abbots, Friars, &c. besides Imperial Ambassadors, under the presidency of the Pope,) also decreed that "every temporal and spiritual Lord shall take oath to exterminate, to the utmost of his power, from the lands subject to his jurisdiction, all heretics denoted by the church."——Does not this look like the Apocalyptic *scarlet* lady that dwelt in the city, clothed with *scarlet*, and that rode upon the *scarlet* colored beast?——But, unfortunately for our Protestant friend Mr. Breckinridge, his antagonist can only rebut this by reminding him that he, too, is *crimsoned* over with the blood of dissenters. But of this in our next. EDITOR.

Progress of Reform.

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

[THOUGH some of the incidents recorded here have been stated in a former number, for the sake of future history and reference we think the following narrative of the progress of the truth in the western part of New York worthy of a place. Brother Moss will please continue his

narrative, but omit as far as possible the details of church courts and synodical councils against heresy. They are all alike, and we have published specimens enough of that spirit that works in all the children of the opposition.]——*Ed. M. H.*

BATAVIA, *New York*, April 29, 1834.

Brother Campbell,

I WILL now give you an account of the reformation in the western part of this state, since I came here in September last. In Pompey, Onondaga county, there was a Baptist church, of seventy members, two-thirds of which have left the city of Babylon, and twenty have been immersed. They have a large two story meeting house, which is generally crowded. One of the number immersed was a Presbyterian student for the ministry, a young man of talent. He has been through the western part of this state, and the northern part of Ohio, lecturing on temperance, as agent for that society. He is said to be a powerful reasoner, and will undoubtedly make an able proclaimer of the truth.

In Syracuse and vicinity seven have been immersed—one of them my sister, a Presbyterian.

In Cicero there was a Baptist church, of one hundred and twelve members, between sixty and seventy of which have been excluded from the Association by an ecclesiastic court, called for that purpose. Thirty-five have been immersed, four of which were Presbyterians, and six added from other societies. The spirit of the Baptist is the same in this state as in Virginia and other places. I was at the Association in Syracuse last September. They said brother Bartlett had been excluded from the church in Victory, and they therefore resolved to treat him accordingly. Brother B. was not present. I saw him the same day, and saw a letter which he had from the Victory church, stating that they had separated by mutual consent, and that brother B. was in good fellowship when they parted. The Association also appointed a committee of five (all clergy) to wait on the Cicero church, (suspected of heresy, although at that time there was not more than five or six that were decidedly on the side of reform,) the 2d Wednesday in January. In the mean time brother Hayden and myself visited them; and before the council met they addressed a circular to the churches of the Association, refusing to meet the council, for the reason that they had transcended their own bounds, as the platform of the Association says, 'that if a church is guilty of immorality, or suspected of heresy, a sister church shall labor with them; and if satisfaction be not obtained, she shall tell it to two or three others, and they together shall visit them; and if they then refuse to hear, they are to be reported to the Association.' The two first steps not having been taken, they utterly refused to meet the council as such; but, as private brethren, said, that their hearts and houses were open to receive them. They requested a place for this in the *Baptist Register* of Utica; but this was refused. The Editor published their refusal to meet the council, and nothing more. The church appointed a three days meeting, to commence on Tuesday preceding the 2d Wednesday, and requested brother Bartlett and myself to attend. Notice of this meeting was given, with the understanding that if the council came they should occupy the house Wednesday afternoon and evening. Notwithstanding this, those opposed engaged the Presbyterian house for the council. Four of the council came, with several others, most of whom were present in the morning, and heard a discourse on the new birth, regeneration, conversion, &c. The house was offered them, which they accepted.

In the afternoon the council organized before a large audience. The Clerk of the church then read the aforesaid circular. This they were prepared for, and at once disorganized; when a committee from a sister church immediately presented itself before them. As they had a standing Moderator, they at once voted to receive said committee. The committee then stated that they had several charges to prefer against them, and requested the church to retire from the congregation, or appoint a committee to hear the charges and make answer. This the church refused to do, as a statement that there were charges, was made before the public, they were willing the public should hear them, as they were guilty of nothing they were ashamed of. As they supposed the charges were for differences of opinion, they said they would propose that two speakers should be appointed, and have a friendly discussion upon any such differences. The committee objected—said, they did not come there for controversy, neither did they wish any. The church then voted to hear the charges then and there. The committee then moved that all the Baptist brethren should have a seat with them. This was agreed to. I then wished to know what constituted a Baptist, and was answered by the Moderator, "An immersed believer." This, of course, admitted brother Bartlett, myself, and others, very much to the annoyance of the committee. The whole former council being now in sitting, the court of inquisition commenced, and instead of preferring charges, began to ask questions. After answering several questions, the church objected to this mode of procedure, saying, that *it was to hear charges*, and *not to answer questions*, that they had agreed. The committee paid no attention to this, but continued to ask questions. The church, seeing that there was no opportunity for investigation, and perceiving that the object was to extort something from their own mouths by which to condemn them, took an evasive course in answering their questions. The committee, after much manœuvring, finding their efforts ineffectual, tried another plan. They asked the church if they had laid aside their articles and covenant. They said they had never passed a vote to that effect. The committee then requested to have them brought into meeting. This the church refused to do, as they had lain in the desk of the Clerk for more than three years, and had not been made use of on any occasion whatever; and as they considered the New Testament to be sufficient for their rule of faith and practice on all occasions, they did not need them on that occasion. The committee then requested those who believed in the articles to arise, and about twenty got up. Those that did not believe all that was contained in the articles were then requested to rise. The church complained of unfair play, and said that they knew from personal knowledge, that some of those that rose first did not believe all that was in the articles, and then proposed to try the question in this way: Those that believed every item to arise; when, verily, three or four arose. And then those that believed the articles generally, to arise; and almost all arose, and thus they were again foiled.

In the evening, after a short discourse by one of their number, they made another attempt by asking questions, and were again unsuccessful. They then complained of ill treatment by the church, proceeded to personal abuse of brother Bartlett and myself, of the church for inviting us

there and allowing us to speak there, and called them "The disciples of *John M. Bartlett*." The church said they thought that the abuse was on the other side; that it was manifest that they neither came there to get any benefit, or to impart any; that the committee had stepped into the tracks of the council, and instead of a sister, laboring or admonishing, their conduct looked more like that of a court of inquisition, sitting to try a criminal, and have him make out his own indictment; that they supposed they had a right, as an independent body, to admit who they pleased to labor with them, without being called to an account, provided their moral characters were good; and they spoke the truth, and then adjourned without time or date. Some of the Baptist Elders were then invited to go home with the brethren, and convince or be convinced; but they did not do it.

The next day brother B., brother W. of Skaneatles, and myself, addressed a large audience in review of the proceedings of said committee and council; after which a discourse was delivered upon the gospel; at the close of which eleven made the good confession, the first that were immersed in that place for the remission of sins.

Soon after this, those opposed assembled a covenant meeting, and in the absence of the brethren (they having forgotten the return of the first day) were proceeding to call a special council, and would have done so had it not have been for a couple of the brethren accidentally coming in. They then called a church meeting, when the church utterly refused to have a council called. Notwithstanding this, the minority proceeded to organize in the face of the majority, by choosing a Moderator and Clerk, and then voted to call a council. The majority immediately proceeded by vote to consider them as gone out from them, according to the provision made in such cases, in the original organization of said church. The council, however, came and recognized the minority as the Regular Baptist Church in that place, and then proceeded to excommunicate the majority. The house was then locked and the key carried off. Two of the brethren called on them for the key, and were informed that the house belonged to the Regular Baptist Society, and as Baptist brethren they could have the use of their———, but in no other way could they have the use of the house. The brethren then informed them, (to their sad surprise) by presenting the Deed, that the house did not belong to that Society, but was deeded to individuals. The key is now given up, the brethren occupy the house, according to the property owned, meet every first day of the week and break bread. While this last council was sitting in Cicero, brother B. and myself were in Pompey, and some of the clergy in said council regretted very much that they had not been to Pompey, as it would now be too late.

In Jefferson county there were two societies, of twelve in number each, (near Father Brewster's,) that met every first day. There have been nineteen immersed here, and several additions from the Baptists. There is one circumstance worthy of noticing here. A licensed preacher, from near Albany in this state, was on a visit to his brother-in-law (a disciple) a few days before the commencement of a three days' meeting in this place, and his friends invited him to stay. He concluded to do so. A Baptist Elder here told him not to do so, for these people did not believe in faith, repentance, regeneration, nor a change of heart; but he told him that he would stay and expose their errors. Being confident that he could do so, he came to meeting with his pencil and paper, fully resolved to put us down. At the close of the first discourse he found (as he said afterwards) that if he opposed these people he must oppose the Bible, if that was the way they preached; for they quoted Scripture for every thing they said. In short, he heard nine discourses without raising his voice in opposition, and then, at the close of the meeting, made a public avowal that what he had heard was the truth, and said that we had been belied—mentioned his own prejudices against us, and his confidence in being able to put us to silence—said that he had never received so much light from the Scriptures before, and that he could give us his heart and hand to go with us. The Association to which he belonged passed a resolution last fall not to open their doors to the disciples; but their resolution is in vain, for brother M. said as we left him that he would stand upon the truth if he stood alone.

In Ira there was a branch of a Baptist church in Cato, Cayuga county. They first cut off the branch, but the work stopped not here. Last winter they appointed a committee to labor with between twenty and thirty members for heresy. They called on one of the Deacons to make one of the committee; but he refused, and said he had a good reason for doing so, for he was of the same mind with those they wished him to visit. One of the members said, "What, Deacon, are you wavering too?" "Not at all," replied he, "I am firmly established!" Between seventy and eighty are on the ground of reformation. Twelve have been immersed.

In Victory there was a Baptist church, of fifty members, one half of which were disciples. Twenty have been immersed, and a number of the Baptists connected. In this place and in Cato the Baptists have passed a resolution to excommunicate every one that breaks bread with the disciples, and have appointed a standing committee to wait on heretics.

In Butler, Wayne county, there was a Baptist church, the most of which were on the reform. They were forty in number. Ten have been immersed, and a number of Baptists converted.

In the vicinity of Auburn, Cayuga county, eight or ten have been immersed, and a number converted. It is now two months since I left there.

J. J. MOSS.

CARLISLE, *Ky.* May 23, 1833.

THE good cause is advancing *slowly* here—but, we think, *surely*. When we say '*slowly*,' we speak comparatively, with reference to our unparalleled success the last two years: for yet, in many places, numerous and important accessions are making to the churches; and, generally, these accessions are commensurate with the labors of public teachers, seconded and rendered effectual by the co-operation of the churches: for what can evangelists do, unless they are aided by the prayers and holy lives of their fellow-christians? But so

far as my observation extends, the churches that have not the labors of some efficient public teacher, although they have their Bishops, and keep the ordinances, are rather declining than advancing. Is it not probable, that some of us have erred in supposing there is little or no need of evangelists? I am satisfied the churches (many of them) are much out of the order of the first churches. I am also satisfied that were the churches in this order, in the true spirit of it, the complaint of *a great harvest and few laborers to gather it*, would measurably cease to be heard: for the churches must be the school of the prophets. But, brother Campbell, is it not to be lamented that so few teachers are coming forward among us to fill the place of those who are wearing out in the good work, and must soon go to the house appointed for all the living? Why is it thus? When we used to believe in special calls, we had preachers enough in point of numbers, for, generally, the bigger the dunce, the louder the call. This was one extreme; and it has its opposite. And I am sometimes afraid that many of us, in a running away from this extreme of enthusiasm, have, on the other hand, passed the *temperate* zone, and gone far into the *frozen* regions. There is, in too many churches, a cold-hearted, lifeless formality, that freezes the energies of those, who, under other circumstances, might become useful teaches among us. Some young men, too, it is to be feared, who have good talents, because they do not meet with proper encouragement from the churches, and because they cannot come out preachers, large as life, at once, become discouraged and give their attention to something else. Men, however, who would honor God and serve their generation as teachers of christianity, must be humble and willing to make sacrifices for Christ's sake. Lord, send laborers into thine harvest!

Grace, mercy, and peace be with you and all yours, from God our Father, and Jesus our blessed Saviour! Amen!

JOHN ROGERS.

PARIS, *Tenn.* May, 1834.

I WAS immersed last November, on one *cold* Lord's day night, myself and two others, the ground being covered with a deep snow, which had fallen in the morning—by brother J. R. M'Call, of Lexington, Ky. Had I have had the gospel explained to me as it *is* in the word of GOD, I expect I should have probably become a Christian at least *fifteen* years ago, (being now in my 26th year;) and should, I expect, have, long before this, been proclaiming the good news to a *deluded*, a benighted, and a dying world. As it is, I have resolved to do so, as soon as I feel sufficiently prepared. I was *religiously* inclined almost from my infancy—from my first recollections; and although I had been occasionally led astray in the paths of error and sin by the syren voice of pleasure, I returned back again each time, with deeper and deeper contrition, until I resolved to forsake the "ways of the world," and accordingly acted up to the spirit of my resolution. For a year, perhaps, or longer, before I was immersed, I was resting in the belief of the remission of my sins—upon *faith alone*, however, for I could not believe in the *miraculous conversions* and *revelations* of the Spirit, as preached up by the sectarian teachers. Shadowy and unconsolatory assurance was it to me! I could not consent to join any of the sects. I had *independence of mind* enough to read the Bible, and *think for myself;* and on comparing their systems with that volume, I found in them ALL *discrepancies* from it, and *objectionable and repulsive features*, occasioned by these departures from apostolic order. The duty of obeying the Lord in immersion pressed heavier and heavier upon me. I heard at length the gospel proclaimed in its truth and purity; an invitation was tendered to those who felt willing to *obey* it; and I gladly embraced the opportunity; like the Jailor and his household, was immersed the same hour of the night; and the consequence is, that I *now feel* a full, a clear, a sensible, and a perfect *remission of my sins*, and can now go along my way *rejoicing*. These, sir, are the outlines of my religious *experience*. I often wonder that I had not discovered the truth sooner! *A vail* was over my mind in reading the Christian Institution. That being now taken

away, all is as plain as objects in the brightest noon day! so plain, that it seems to me, that "he who *runs* may read," and "wayfaring men, though *fools*, cannot err therein."

In the hope of a glorious immortality, your brother in Christ,

JOHN R. HOWARD.

STREETSBOROUGH, *Ohio*, June 11, 1834.

IN Wooster four were immersed, although the Baptist brethren had their state convention at the same time there, and many hearers. There were more to hear us also than could get into the court-house, notwithstanding it was rumored you would not be there. My judgment, as well as that of the brethren and the citizens, was, that the most favorable impression was made; and if Wooster could be well attended a large church might soon be raised up there. There are now seven or eight disciples in the village. But in Aurora the most was done. Brother Forward, a worthy, talented brother, from Somerset, Pa. was here. The meeting began on Friday. The assembly was very large until Monday evening, by which time 20 were immersed. Brother Forward continued teaching publicly, and from house to house. Thirty-five in all were immersed, among whom were some of our principal citizens. In Mentor, beginning Friday the 6th, our meeting continued four days, and 8 were immersed. The disciples are all rejoicing in love and hope. I have this moment received a letter from brother Moss, dated Rochester, N. Y. June 1st. He writes he has been to Canada recently—41 immersed, and prospects good.

WM. HAYDEN.

LEXINGTON, *Ky.* June 14, 1834.

YOURS of the last month I found at home on my return from a visit to Indiana and Ohio, in attendance at certain meetings held in Rising Sun, Cincinnati, and Carthage, with brethren Rogers, Johnson, Jamieson, O'Kane, Mitchell, Martin, Brown, Scott, and Burnett; part of whom labored in word and teaching at these several places. Some fifty persons were immersed during the progress of these meetings, and many from other congregations united. In Cincinnati and Carthage the people glorified the word of the Lord by believing and obeying it, and we left the disciples greatly edified and filled with joy. I was rejoiced to meet with so many teachers from different states, eminently qualified for usefulness, who spoke the good things of the kingdom with so much accuracy and power, and upon whom such a divine gracefulness rested. Nothing is so admirable as the great diversity of the gifts, talents, and attainments, that the gospel proclaimed among us has consecrated. Whatever is good and excellent, whatever is lovely and of good report in man, under the administration of Jesus, will be brought out; and whatever is mean and contemptible, base and wicked, will be debased; as it brings to light the hidden things of darkness and makes manifest the counsels of the heart.

I learned that in Indiana a number of evangelists were constantly in the field, and that their labors were greatly successful. I met with old Father *Eckles*, whose praise is in all the churches in that state, for his zeal, and patience, and the abundance of his labors in the bounds of a great number of congregations. He labors in word and *teaching*—I suppose more in the latter than the former, as he makes it his business to visit the congregations with their bishops and deacons, to read to them out of the Book how to live and what to do, and to exhort them to abound in all good works. He labors without reward, not as an example, but that he may with more success enforce upon the disciples the duty and necessity of supporting those who devote their time and talents to the work of the Lord. I find the churches in these parts in a very prostrate condition, and how to raise them I know not. I believe the reformation is suffering greatly here from the fact of our having an interest in so many Baptist meeting houses, which precludes the probability of meeting in the same place on the first day of the week. I have been almost tempted to pray that the disciples may be entirely excluded from every Baptist house in the

land, that they may be obliged to build suitable edifices for themselves. I do verily believe that the strife and contention among us about meeting houses, has been a fruitful cause of evil. The law of the land, I know, gives them a right to occupy, part of the time, these houses; but though lawful, I think it is not expedient. JAMES CHALLEN.

Summary of News.

THE gospel continues to triumph in various sections of the union over infidelity and sectarianism. O that it may equally triumph over the love of the world, and fill the hearts of millions with peace, and love, and joy, and the triumphant hope of heaven!

In Nashville, Tennessee, there have been continued accessions to the brethren. That congregation has always been alive to the general interests of the kingdom. Liberal in its views and in its contributions for the gospel, it has prospered beyond most of the congregations in the West. Brother A. Adams, one of their evangelists, has been, in conjunction with other brethren, so successfully pleading the cause of reform, that now the church in Nashville numbers more than 500 members.

In Carthage and the surrounding country, Hamilton county, Ohio, under the labors of our highly gifted and much beloved brother Walter Scott, occasionally assisted by other evangelists, the gospel has triumphed over all sorts of opposition; so that the congregation in Carthage, from nothing, or almost less than nothing, now enrolls more than two hundred names, and this in less than two years. To these have been added the other day 23 new converts, the fruit of one big meeting.

The congregation in Cincinnati also continues to increase. Our beloved and much esteemed brother Burnet, so well known as mighty in the Scriptures, now labors as an evangelist in that city. He informed us the other day of the result of a two or three days' meeting, at which 23 were added to the congregation—now above 300 strong.

In Baltimore the disciples are still increasing in numbers, and growing in the knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ our Lord. A Methodist preacher, of good standing as to moral character, twenty years a minister of the Methodist society, was recently immersed into the faith, and now candidly acknowledges that he does not know but the first principles of the glad tidings of the reign of heaven. This congregation will surely be able to edify itself in love. Brother George Austin, one of the most intelligent of the eldership of Sharp street church, has also recently united with them. They already possess many gifted brethren, besides the much experienced Elders Carman and Farquherson. They expect in a few days to consecrate the new meeting house—by meeting in it to keep the ordinances of the Saviour as delivered to them by the Holy Twelve.

In New York also there have been some recent additions to the congregation in Hudson street. These brethren must prosper, because they make no compromise with the world. They are determined to build on the original foundation, and to receive into their fellowship all who show love to the Saviour by keeping his commandments, without regard to differences of opinion on matters purely speculative. Brother Silas E. Shephard is now laboring among them. I pray that he may be as successful in New York as in other places. Evangelists from the West, who visit New York, are invited to call upon the brethren in Hudson street to assist them in proclaiming the word.

In the western part of the state success attends the footsteps of those who proclaim the ancient faith.

Brother James Henshal, of Baltimore, who occasionally does the work of an evangelist, lately visited Washington county, Md. He had two meetings for proclaiming the glad tidings, at one of which brother Philip G. Young also attended. These meetings were of two days continuance each. At Beaver Creek the school teacher confessed the Lord, and at the next meeting he stood up in defence of the original gospel. Five were immersed at Coffman's, near

Williamsport. Thus the gospel is sounding out from the congregation in Baltimore into the interior of Maryland. Brother Young, under date of June 11th, writes as follows:—

"Since my visit to Maryland, one year ago, the number of the disciples has multiplied considerably. There are now five churches, or five different neighborhoods, in this county, where the Lord's death is published each first day. The disciples are increasing in courage and knowledge, while the opposition is becoming less formidable. The Bible, also, is treated with more respect, while the creeds, and teaching of the clergy, are not so sacred in the eye of the people. These circumstances speak loudly for the prosperity of Zion.

On the 7th and 8th we held a two days' meeting at Jacob Rudge's, on Beaver Creek. Four were planted in the likeness of the Saviour's death. The congregation was large (seven or eight hundred) and attentive. Honesty and candor seemed to be the characteristics of the people, and many were solicitous to find the right way.

The disciples in Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York were full of zeal, and treated me with Christian courtesy.

The coming week, all things concurring, I shape my course to the West."

Our amiable brother *Pendleton*, of King & Queen county, Va. says, under date of the 9th June:—

"On the 30th of last month began a protracted meeting at our house of worship, (Smyrna,) which continued four days. There were present eight proclaimers of the word, among whom were your father, brother Thomas, brother Short, &c. Brother Thomas delivered three able discourses to large and attentive audiences. Although it rained very much on Saturday and Sunday, there were present many of our brethren, some few of the sects, many of whom went away complaining heavily of brother Thomas. But two of the Methodists, (one of whom is a very intelligent gentleman,) together with fourteen other persons, have been immersed into water, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, for the remission of their sins, by brother Duval; fifteen of whom have joined the congregation—eight ladies and seven gentlemen. One of them is a colored person, of much intelligence. So we see that the truth plainly spoken may offend the sects, but at the same time awakens sinners."

Many interesting letters are necessarily excluded. We shall conclude with an extract from one from the land of our ancestors:—

PERTH, *Scotland*, April 7, 1834.

It is now three years since I sent you a few hasty scraps, containing some account of the body of Christians with whom I was connected, our operations, &c. You would perceive from the numbers of our magazine, that our principles were universal toleration and free communion in its utmost extent. Paidobaptism and baptism I find do not form either a very pleasant or very useful union. I find that the Baptist must bring his mind to concede one of the ordinances of Christ altogether, or the union will be often *disturbed*, *confused*, and *uncomfortable*. I have been learning now for three years, that the communion acknowledged in Scripture, is of obedient disciples, and not of those who neglect the positive commands of the Redeemer for the vain traditions of men. I acknowledge myself greatly indebted to you for the valuable papers I have read in your *Millennial Harbinger*. The vol. for 1832 I have now on my table; but it is borrowed. I should be glad to obtain a copy for myself if a cheap mode of conveyance could be adopted.

In Perth our church was formed, January, 1831, on free communion principles; but I feel myself every day more dissatisfied, and last night delivered a discourse on what I believe to be the gospel pattern of a New Testament church, from Col. i. 18. I stated that the *body*, of which the *Redeemer* is the only *head*, is composed of *living materials*—men raised and quickened, and made spiritually alive—materials conformed to the head, resembling and imitating the head in all things at all imitable—materials united to, and connected with the head, and deriving all *direction*, *influence*, and *vitality* from him—that these materials were to be distinguished and known as such by their *obedience*, and by *wearing the garb* of sons—that we become the materials by regeneration, which includes the renewing of the mind and the washing of water, by which we are introduced into the kingdom of God. To admit unbaptized persons to the table of the Lord, is to admit either *ignorant* or *disobedient* persons, either of which cannot worthily communicate in the interesting and significant ordinance of the Lord's supper. I endeavored also to show the necessity of breaking bread weekly, and thus keeping before us constantly the *death* and *resurrection* of Christ—the importance of every member employing his gifts and influence for the welfare of the body, *&c. &c.* I name these things not to instruct you, but to inform you that we are unlearning the scholastic doctrines of men, and learning a little more in the *old-fashioned*, yet *infallible* school of the Redeemer.

J. BURNS.

"BEHOLD A GREATER THAN SOLOMON IS HERE!"

Dear brother Campbell,

A VENERABLE Clergyman, not long since ordained to the ministry by a Presbytery of the first stamp among the Regular Baptists, preached a sermon at —— church, in the hearing of your humble servant, from the 30th chapter of Proverbs, 18th and 19th verses; but dwelt particularly on the 19th verse: "The way of an eagle in the air; the way of a serpent on a rock; the way of a ship in the midst of the sea; and the way of a man with a maid."

After informing us that these things were too wonderful for Solomon, *he* explained them in the following manner:—

1st. "*The way of an eagle in the air.*" This, he said, was an emblem of the church soaring on the wings of faith to the mansions of her future rest.

2d. "*The way of a serpent on a rock.*" This, I think, he explained to be the mysterious working of the Spirit on the hearts of the penitent.

3d. "*The way of a ship in the midst of the sea.*" This, he said, prefigured the church in the world struggling with the adversity of the flesh and sin.

4th. "*The way of a man with a maid.*" The maid, an emblem of the church, and the man being Christ, the way of her conversion to him was too mysterious for Solomon.

Now as we have never been looking for a *greater* than Solomon since the coming of Christ, and especially as we never heard this text explained before, some of us are in doubt whether this be the true meaning, and should therefore like to hear from you. A hint will suffice. TIMOTHY.

Sullivan County, Indiana, May 23, 1834.

CARTHAGE, O. June 2, 1834.

DEBATE.—On Tuesday morning brother *John T. Johnson*, of Kentucky, and Dr. *Sleigh*, of London, debated the following question in the meeting-house:—

Is remission of sin by Jesus Christ, conditional or unconditional?

Dr. Sleigh assumed that it was unconditional. Brother Johnson, in one overwhelming speech, proved that sinners were pardoned on the conditions of faith, repentance, confession, and baptism; and that the saints were pardoned on the condition of their confession. [*Evangelist.*]

Obituary.

AFTER a protracted illness of five months, which she bore with Christian fortitude and resignation, on the 24th of June, and in the 23d year of her age, departed this life, in the hope of a blissful immortality, JANE CAROLINE EWING, wife of *Albert G. Ewing*, of Nashville, Ten. and eldest daughter of *A. Campbell*, Bethany, Va. She has left a bereaved husband and three infant children, with a large circle of relatives and friends to lament their loss.

A Dirge.

"EARTH to earth, and dust to dust!"
Here the evil and the just;
Here the youthful and the old;
Here the fearful and the bold;
Here the matron and the maid
In one silent bed are laid;
Here the vassal and the king
Side by side lie withering;
Here the sword and sceptre rust;
"Earth to earth, and dust to dust!"

Age on age shall roll along
O'er this pale and mighty throng;
Those that wept them, those that weep,
All shall with these sleepers sleep.
Brothers, sisters of the worm,
Summer's sun, or winter's storm,
Song of peace, or battle's roar,
Ne'er shall break their slumbers more;
Death shall keep his sullen trust—
Earth to earth, and dust to dust!"

But a day is coming fast,
Earth, thy mightiest and thy last!
It shall come in fear and wonder,
Heralded by trump and thunder:
It shall come in strife and toil;
It shall come in blood and spoil;
It shall come in empires' groans,
Burning temples, trampled thrones
Then, Ambition, true thy lust!
"Earth to earth, and dust to dust!"

Then shall come the judgment sign,
In the east, the King shall shine;
Flashing from heaven's golden gate,
Thousands, thousands round his state
Spirits with the crown and plume;
Tremble, then, thou solemn tomb!
Heaven shall open on our sight,
Earth be turn'd to living light,
Kingdom of the ransom'd Just!
"Earth to earth, and dust to dust!"

Then thou mount, Jerusalem,
Shall be gorgeous as a gem:
Then shall in the desert rise
Fruits of more than Paradise;
Earth by angel feet be trod,
One great garden of her God!
Till are dried the martyr's tears,
Through a thousand glorious years!
Now in hope of him we trust,
"Earth to earth, and dust to dust!"

[*G. Croly.*]

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Number VIII.——Volume V.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Bethany, Va. August, 1834.

Mr. J. A. Waterman.

From the Western Christian Advocate, of June 6.

According to promise, we shall now proceed to publish Rev. J. A. Waterman's letters to Rev. A. Campbell, and for the present, at the *special request* of brother W., we will comply with Mr. C's terms, by publishing his replies. This course we have consented, after much consultation and reflection, to adopt only so far as it relates to the *address*, running perhaps through three numbers of the Harbinger. After that, we expect to publish only brother W's letters, prepared for our own paper. We understand this address to Mr. C., was by him, contrary to the expectation of the writer, cut up into numbers; this, however, will be no inconvenience to us, as it will enable us to go on with both sides of the correspondence together. The reader will also understand that this is not the first part of their correspondence, but it is the part with which we are requested to commence. [*Ed. Adv.*]

IT seems that Mr. Waterman's "*special request*," superadded to the demands of both law and justice, was necessary to procure the republication of the copy-right part of our correspondence. But his "special request" is to avail nothing for the future; for the Editor says, "We expect to publish only brother Waterman's letters, prepared for our own paper." If Mr. Waterman furnishes any letters to me, under said restriction and with this understanding, I now inform him and the public, that I will pay no attention to them, considering that such a one-sided course is an ample refutation of them, so far as they are controversial. My answer to them is written before they are published, in the words following, *to wit:*—

Whereas the writer and publisher of said letters have agreed that they shall appear in the Methodist prints without my replies; and that, as far as they have influence and authority, the Methodists shall read only the Methodist side of the correspondence;—considering this to be of the very essence of Popery, I cannot righteously encourage, directly or indirectly, so great injustice; and considering that

a more signal and unequivocal triumph could not be obtained for the cause I espouse, than that ("after much consultation and reflection") the conductors of the Methodist press, in Cincinnati, decided that it was not advisable to allow my reasonings to reach the eyes or ears of the Methodist Society. For these reasons, which to my optics are just and fair, I must thank these gentlemen Methodists for having themselves given such a verdict in favor of my pleadings. But if they should repent of this decision, and give me an assurance that they will republish my replies to said letters, giving me as much room in their columns as I give to Mr. Waterman on my pages, then, in that case, I will copy into my periodical all such letters as demand an answer from me, and give to my readers all the information which Mr. Waterman has to offer on the subjects in debate.

☞ The said Editor copied from his brethren in New York a question on "THE TRINITY," which he desired me to answer for his special satisfaction. But as I am to be precluded from his pages, I will call upon Mr. Waterman to answer it for me; and if I differ in any thing from him on this "vital point," I will state wherein. I think, however, I may venture to say that I will endorse for him on this subject.——All of which is respectfully submitted.

EDITOR.

July 3d, 1834.

Sir Francis Bacon on Atheism.

I HAD rather believe all the fables in the legend, and the Talmud, and the Alcoran, than that this universal frame is without a mind; and, therefore, God never wrought miracles to convince atheism, because his ordinary works convince it. It is true that a little philosophy inclineth man's mind to atheism, but depth in philosophy bringeth men's minds about to religion; for, while the mind of man looketh upon the second causes scattered, it may sometimes rest in them, and go no farther; but when it beholdeth the chain of them confederate and linked together, it must needs fly to Providence and Deity: nay, even that school, which is most accused of atheism, doth most demonstrate religion; that is, the school of Leucippus, and Democritus, and Epicurus: for it is a thousand times more credible, that four mutable elements and one immutable fifth essence, duly and eternally placed, need no God, than that an army of infinite small portions, or seeds unplaced, should have produced this order and beauty without a divine marshal. The Scripture saith, "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God;" it is not said, 'The fool hath thought in his heart;' so as he rather saith it by rote to himself, as that he would have, than that he can thoroughly believe it, or be persuaded of it; for none deny there is a God but those for whom it maketh that there were no God. It appeareth in nothing more, that atheism is rather in the lip than in the heart of man, than by this, that atheists will ever be talking of that their opinion, as if they fainted in it within themselves, and

would be glad to be strengthened by the opinion of others: nay, more, you shall have atheists strive to get disciples, as it fareth with other sects; and, which is most of all, you shall have of them that will suffer for atheism, and not recant; whereas, if they did truly think that there were no such thing as God, why should they trouble themselves? Epicurus is charged, that he did not dissemble for his credit's sake, when he affirmed there were blessed natures, but such as enjoyed themselves without having respect to the government of the world; wherein they say he did temporize, though in secret he thought there was no God: but certainly he is traduced, for his words are noble and divine: "*Non Deos vulgi negare profanum; sed vulgi opiniones diis applicare profanum*"—[*It is not profane to deny the gods of the multitude, but it is profane to apply the opinions of the multitude to the gods.*] Plato could have said no more; and, although he had the confidence to deny the administration, he had not the power to deny the nature. The Indians of the West have names for their particular gods, though they have no name for God; as if the heathens should have had the names Jupiter, Apollo, Mars, &c. but not the word Deus; which shows, that even those barbarous people have the notion, though they have not the latitude and extent of it: so that against atheists the very savages take part with the very subtilest philosophers. The contemplative atheist is rare, a Diagoras, a Bion, a Lucian, perhaps, and some others; and yet they seem to be more than they are; for that all that impugn a received religion, or superstition, are, by the adverse part, branded with the name of atheists: but the great atheists indeed are hypocrites, which are ever handling holy things, but without feeling; so that they must needs be cauterized in the end. The causes of atheism are, divisions in religion, if there be many; for any one main division addeth zeal to both sides, but many divisions introduce atheism: another is, scandal of priests, when it is come to that which St. Bernard saith, "*Non est jam dicere, ut populus, sic sacerdos; quia nec sic populus, ut sacerdos*"—[*No longer is it fitting to say*, Like people, like priest; *for now the priest is not like the people.*] A third is, a custom of profane scoffing in holy matters, which doth, by little and little, deface the reverence of religion: and, lastly, learned times, especially with peace and prosperity; for troubles and adversities do more bow men's minds to religion. They that deny a God destroy a man's nobility; for certainly man is of kin to the beasts by his body; and, if he be not of kin to God by his spirit, he is a base and ignoble creature. It destroys, likewise, magnanimity, and the raising human nature; for, take an example of a dog, and mark what a generosity and courage he will put on when he finds himself maintained by a man, who to him is instead of a God, or "*melior natura*," [*better nature;*] which courage is manifestly such as that creature, without that confidence of a better nature than his own, could never attain. So man, when he resteth and assureth himself upon divine protection and favor, gathereth a force and faith, which human nature in itself could not obtain; therefore, as

atheism is in all respects hateful, so in this, that it depriveth human nature of the means to exalt itself above human frailty.

Sir Francis Bacon on Superstition.

IT were better to have no opinion of God at all, than such an opinion as is unworthy of him; for the one is unbelief, the other is contumely; and certainly superstition is the reproach of the Deity. Plutarch saith well to that purpose: "Surely (saith he) I had rather a great deal men should say there was no such a man at all as Plutarch, than that they should say, There was one Plutarch that would eat his children as soon as they were born," as the poets speak of Saturn: and, as the contumely is greater towards God, so the danger is greater towards men. Atheism leaves a man to sense, to philosophy, to natural piety, to laws, to reputation: all which may be guides to an outward moral virtue, though religion were not; but superstition dismounts all these, and erecteth an absolute monarchy in the minds of men: therefore atheism did never perturb states; for it makes men wary of themselves, as looking no farther. and we see the times inclined to atheism (as the time of Augustus Cesar) were civil times: but superstition hath been the confusion of many states, and bringeth in a new *primum mobile*, that ravisheth all the spheres of government. The master of superstition is the people, and in all superstition wise men follow fools; and arguments are fitted to practice in a reversed order. It was gravely said, by some of the prelates in the council of Trent, where the doctrine of the schoolmen bare great sway, that the schoolmen were like astronomers, which did feign eccentrics and epicicles, and such engines of orbs, to save the phenomena, though they knew there were no such things: and, in like manner, that the schoolmen had framed a number of subtile and intricate axioms and theorems, to save the practice of the church. The causes of superstition are pleasing and sensual rites and ceremonies; excess of outward and pharisaical holiness; over-great reverence of traditions, which cannot but load the church; the stratagems of prelates for their own ambition and lucre; the favoring too much of good intentions, which openeth the gate to conceits and novelties; the taking an aim at divine matters by human, which cannot but breed mixture of imaginations; and, lastly, barbarous times, especially joined with calamities and disasters. Superstition, without a veil, is a deformed thing; for, as it addeth deformity to an ape to be so like a man, so the similitude of superstition to religion makes it the more deformed: and, as wholesome meat corrupteth to little worms, so good forms and orders corrupt into a number of petty observances. There is a superstition in avoiding superstition, when men think to do best if they go farthest from the superstition formerly received; therefore care should be had that (as it fareth in ill purgings) the good be not taken away with the bad, which commonly is done when the people is the reformer.

The Spirit of the Nations of Antiquity

Was the Spirit of Selfishness, of Rapine, and of War.

LYCURGUS exclaimed, as he rode through the country of Laconia, that it looked like the patrimony of brothers. It was, indeed, the patrimony of a family; but that family was degraded and brutalized by institutions, whose sole object was the destruction of their fellow-creatures. Sparta regarded peace, the natural condition of man, as disgraceful; war, his unnatural state, as honorable. The Spartan had no feelings—no sentiments, but those of a soldier; no conception of glory, but as military fame: no happiness or duties at home, but in warlike education; no joy or ambition abroad, but in the camp, the march, or the battle-field. To receive his wounds in front; to die sword in hand; to be carried homeward upon his shield, were the limit of his desires, the highest satisfaction of which he was capable. The character of man was stretched on the iron bed of Procrustes; that of woman was degraded, and her tenderness, delicacy, and loveliness were broken as on the wheel of a ruthless tyranny; while the infant, if unfit for the bloody work of destruction, was cast out to perish in the fields. Under such institutions, *the Spartan was a savage*, scarcely more elevated than the Indian of North America. Such were the boasted institutes of Lycurgus; and what a commentary on the character of them and their author is found in the fact, that he should have cheated the people, by a miserable trick, into their perpetual observance.

Let us now turn to the founder of the Roman monarchy. In him we behold a man who slew his brother with his own hand, who violated the sacred laws of hospitality, who inveigled by fraud the Sabin women into his power, and seized them by force. What other morality, indeed, could have been expected of a fratricide, the captain of robbers, and murderers, and outlaws! Such was the man who laid the foundations of Rome, called, in the boastful language of her people, the Eternal City. And what were her institutions, from beginning to end, but those of war? What was her sole employment, from the cradle to the grave, but rapine and murder? She died, as she had lived—by the sword; and as she had carried fire and carnage, with unrelenting fury and insatiable ambition into all the neighboring countries, she perished at last, not in the lists of chivalry, with the gallant, the civilized, and the polished, but by the hands of barbarians, who rolled backward over the Alps upon her beautiful Italy, the deluge of blood, which had overflowed Helvetia and Germany, Gaul and Belgium, and Britain. Such has been the fate of every people, with scarcely an exception! How just and awful are the judgments of God! for all of them arose and flourished by rapine and bloodshed. Shall I be told that Rome carried her arts with her arms, and civilized the independent states which she enslaved? What then shall we say to the thief and assassin, who should act in like manner? Shall we regard it as a merit, that after slaying the parent, they have educated

the child out of his father's property? After invading the peace of a family, laying waste its heritage, seizing all its property, and murdering or imprisoning its natural protectors, is it matter of commendation that they should restore and improve agriculture and the arts out of its own wealth, more especially since they delivered that family to the charge of oppressive strangers? Such were the principles, and such the conduct of kingly, of republican, of imperial Rome. Romulus, then, was the founder of a state *whose whole life of twelve hundred years was devoted to carnage and rapine.* Lycurgus was the author of a petty scheme of violence and destruction; Romulus of a vast system of selfishness and ambition, of fraud, bloodshed, and ruin. Each had the merit, and only the merit of creating a nation of murderers and plunderers.

O! how consolatory, how delightful, how refreshing, to turn from such monsters, and contemplate the serene and benevolent life, the diffusive charity, and wide-spreading usefulness of Robert Raikes! If it were possible for him to meet in the world of spirits Sesostris and Pericles, Hannibal, Alcibiades and Lucullus, how would they stand rebuked in his presence, and look upon his form of light, and his angel countenance, as Satan beheld Zephon—

> ——"*Abash'd the devil stood,*
> *And felt how awful goodness is, and saw*
> *Virtue in her shape how lovely!*"

The institutions of Raikes were those of peace and love, of justice and order. Their principle was obedience to God, good will to man; their means—the improvement of the mind and heart; their end—the temporal and eternal good of mankind. They have sent forth soldiers into every land; but these were the soldiers of the Cross. Their armies have gone forth, throughout the earth, conquering and to conquer, but it is in the name and to the glory of the Prince of Peace. They have invaded the little sanctuary of home, the social circle of the village, the crowded streets of the city, and the vast community of nations. But they have gone forth, in the spirit of love, to bless and not to curse, to ransom the captive and not to enslave the free, to comfort the afflicted, to enlighten the ignorant, to gladden the wilderness and solitary place, and bid the desert to rejoice and blossom as the rose. Pyrrhus exclaimed, as he walked over the battle-ground on the banks of the Liris, O! with what ease could I conquer the world, had I the Romans for soldiers, or they me for their king! The Christian knows that there shall be but one universal Conqueror, and one universal Empire. That Conqueror, Isaiah beheld in the visions of prophecy, glorious in his apparel, travelling in the greatness of his strength; he that speaks in righteousness, mighty to save. That Empire is the Kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ, the Holy Church Universal.——[*Grimke.*]

Christian Scheme of Education.

THERE is one consideration of vast importance in determining the best character of a scheme of education; and it bears directly on the

question of the comparative merits of the Christian and Classical standards. It is this: The spirit of the gospel is essentially the spirit of peace and humility, of love and forbearance. It is an amiable, conciliating, philanthropic spirit. It is full of moral dignity, and beauty, and courage. It is essentially the spirit of duty, the spirit of God himself. But what is the spirit that lives and moves throughout the classical models? It is the spirit of war, foreign and civil, the spirit of ambition and pride, of hatred, contempt, and oppression. It is a blood-thirsty, unforgiving, intolerant spirit. Take from the Iliad or the Æneid its military scenes, and achievements, and heroes, and the poem is in ruins. Take the like from the Scripture Epic of Milton, and the great, the mighty whole is scarcely more impaired, than "Jerusalem Delivered," by discarding the Episode of Olindo and Sophronia. Take the like from the Classic Historians, and the sun-bright History of Greece and Rome, "in dim eclipse, disastrous twilight sheds." But take the same from the History of Europe, since the Reformation, and especially from the History of England and of these United States, and *that* remains which we look for *in vain* among the Ancients,—*political, constitutional, commercial, literary and religious* history, the history of *principles*, and *institutions*, of *society* and *government*. WAR is the *very soul* of poetry and history in the classics. Does it not then become us to abandon them as unfit means of instruction for youth, unless we mean practically to deny the incomparable superiority of the *peaceful* spirit of the New Testament? Can we doubt that the warlike spirit, which has desolated Europe for eighteen hundred years, in spite of the religion of Jesus, is to be ascribed, in a good measure, to the extravagant admiration of the classics, to the imitation of Greek and Roman, instead of Christian Heroes, and to the unchristian character of general education? Christianity has warred in vain against military ambition and military glory; since every educated man has been thoroughly imbued with the military, that ruling spirit of Greece and Rome. Banish this spirit, and we shall see and hear less of war and more of peace, less of heroes and more of philanthropists, less of warriors and more of statesmen, less of false glory and honor, and more of true, less of the spirit of the French Revolution, and more of the spirit of our own. I rejoice that the spirit of the age, and the spirit of our country especially, are becoming more and more rational, peaceful, Christian. Let this great change in education be made, and we may rest assured that the rulers and politicians of all nations will be

> ——— ———"*bent on higher views,*
> *To civilize the rude unpolish'd world,*
> *And lay it under the restraint of laws;*
> *To make man mild and sociable to man;*
> *To cultivate the wild licentious savage*
> *With wisdom, discipline and liberal arts;*
> *Th' embellishments of life* ——— ———." [Grimke.]

A Definition of Faith.

AS our orthodox Baptist brethren are often objecting to our definitions of faith, and publishing their own definitions, I have thought it might be satisfactory to them for me to publish one of their most evangelical definitions, and substitute it for my own. I therefore quote the following from the *Baptist Cross & Journal*. As they have taken it from the *Sunday School Journal*, it must be well approved by all the orthodox:—

FAITH.

In Mr. Abbott's new book, "*The Corner Stone*," is the following illustration of faith:—

Faith means confidence; not merely cold, intellectual conviction, but confidence; a feeling of the heart. To show this distinction clearly, imagine a man unaccustomed to such an elevation, to be taken to the summit of some lofty spire, and asked to step out from an opening there, upon a narrow board, suspended by ropes over the dizzy height. How will he shrink back instinctively from it! Explain to him the strength of the ropes, show him their size, and convince him by the most irresistible evidence that they have abundant strength to support many times his weight. Can you make him willing to trust himself to them? No. But the builder, whose confidence in the suspended scaffolding has been established by experience, stands upon it without fear, and looks down to the stony pavement a hundred feet below, with an unmoved and steady eye. Now you must have such faith in Christ's sufferings and death, as not merely to admit their efficacy, but to trust yourself to it.

A father was once amusing a number of children with an electric machine, and after one or two had touched the knob and received the shock, they drew back from the apparatus, and looked upon it with evident dread. The father presently held out to them the jar, uncharged, and consequently harmless, and said distinctly, but without emphasis, "If you touch it now you will feel nothing. Who will try?"

The children drew back with their hands behind them.

"You do not believe me," said he.

"Yes, sir," said they with one voice; and several hands were held out to prove their faith; but they were quickly withdrawn, before reaching the dangerous knob. One alone, a timid little girl, had *that kind* of confidence in her father which led her really to trust him. The rest believed his word, but had not heartfelt faith in it. Even the little believer's faith was not unwavering. You could see on her face, when the little knuckle approached the harmless brass ball, a slight expression of anxiety, showing that she had some doubts and fears after all; and there was an evident feeling of relief when she touched the knob, and found, from actual trial, that her father's word was true, and that there was really nothing there.

This last is Christian faith exactly. It not only believes what the Saviour says, but it acts in reliance upon it. It *trusts* to Christ, and throws itself upon him, and tries to hush its remaining fears, and to feel fully the confidence which it knows is deserved. Still there will be too often a slight misgiving—a hesitating fear, alternating and mingling with its confidence and love, and expressing itself in the prayer, "Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief." There ought not to be the slightest misgiving. It is sinful and unreasonable, even in the least possible degree.

Now if they will not recant this definition when I approve it, I will say to them, that I regard no faith as worth a farthing in religion which falls a single jot short of this definition of it. Whether they have come over to me, or I have gone over to them, I hope will create

no disturbance. I can assure them that I never regarded any thing as worthy of the name *faith* which does not fully fill up the measure of the aforesaid definition. *Ld. M. H.*

DEFINITION OF REPENTANCE.

AS I have given a definition of FAITH from the Baptists and the orthodox Journal of the Sunday School, I would add a definition of REPENTANCE, such as corresponds fully with our views, as published in the *Essay on Regeneration;* taken from the Methodist Western Christian Advocate, and by the conductors of that journal taken from *the Boston Recorder:*—

INTERESTING CASE OF RESTITUTION.

A FORTNIGHT since I received a letter from an unknown individual, containing $143, purporting to be the amount, with compound interest added, of property fraudulently taken from the persons named in the letter. The writer requested that I would pay to each person the sum affixed to his name. He states that a few years ago he thinks he became a Christian; since which time he has been engaged in paying off smaller debts of the character above named. Having been unfortunate in business, with a family dependent upon him for support, it has cost him much labor to raise this money; but he has persevered, and now returns the injured persons their property with interest upon interest. Four of these individuals are amongst the principal jewelers in this city, and the sums returned are 45, 37, and 11 dollars. He says that there are a few more sums yet due, which he is laboring to obtain, "until all shall receive their own." It furthermore appears from circumstances mentioned in his letter, that he has considerable influence in his church, of which he is an active member, and is not without weight of character as a citizen. I am led to infer from his communications that he has not chosen its own minister to do this office for him, being desirous of averting suspicion, unless it should be made clear that repentance and reparation ought to be accompanied with a personal confession. Inasmuch as God hath seen fit to preserve him from loss of character before men, I have not advised him to do any thing which would seem to be throwing away that which he has thus been permitted to keep; especially as his Christian character and the honor of religion are not implicated by his crime. Yet he seems to be willing to do every thing that may be thought proper in the case, and in all respects manifests right feelings upon the subject.

It would seem that his Maker is satisfied with what he has done; the least, therefore, that man can say, is, "Neither do I condemn thee; go and sin no more." The individuals to whom the money has been paid are entirely satisfied with the reparation, and have no desire to be acquainted with the person concerned. He has expressed a willingness that I should make use of this matter in any way calculated to do good. The knowledge of it may lead some others who have been sinners in the same manner to see what are the genuine fruits of repentance in such persons. There is in the feelings of this man that entire forgetfulness of self which always accompanies deep conviction of sin; so much so, that nothing but the injury which an open disclosure might do in various ways, prevents him from making it; but the circumstance of his returning compound interest shows that he has gone to the utmost extent of suitable proof that his sorrow is of the right kind. He does not hesitate to call himself 'a thief;' he certainly appears to be a '*penitent* thief;' and trusting in the mercy of that Saviour in whom he professes to have believed, he may with freedom add, 'Lord, remember me, when thou comest into thy kingdom.'

Respectfully.

N. ADAMS,
Pastor of the Essex street Church.

Boston, April 9, 1834.

This definition in fact of repentance I cordially approve, and hold that it is the only repentance which will pass the scrutiny of Heaven. From this time forth I hope to be regarded as sound on *two* capital points at least—namely, *faith* and *repentance*. *Ed. M. H.*

Catholic Controversy---No. 7.

'HEAR BOTH SIDES' is our motto in an age of controversy like the present. Mr. Breckinridge has recorded the bloody deeds of Catholics in determining disputes in the church: we must now hear Mr. Hughes offsett these tales of cruelty by a narrative of Protestant Presbyterian persecutions and proscriptions:—

"All are agreed that *this charge* comes with a peculiarly bad grace from either John Calvin or any of his disciples. There is blood upon his memory; and it looks doubly dark and deep when associated with the recollections that he set up to be *a man of God*, and a *reformer* of the church of Christ. Bellarmine, indeed, sanctioned the right of Catholic princes to wield the sword of civil power against persons condemned by the church of heresy; but so far as he is concerned, the fact exhibits only the *theory* of persecution and the sanction of his pen. Calvin's was the sanction of the pen and faggot—the theory and the *practice*. The example of the master has been faithfully imitated by his followers. And, appealing to the decision of impartial history, I defy you to show a single state in Europe or America, in which Calvinists or Presbyterians conceded free *toleration* from the moment they possessed civil power, whether derived by grant from the crown, as in New England; or acquired, as in Europe, by rebellion and usurpation!

"If, then, history does not contain one single exception, on this head, I would leave it to the good sense of our readers, whether it is wise, whether it is modest in you to charge Catholics with persecution, and that too, in the name of a sect which has stained the soil of every country in which it ruled, with the blood of the Protestant, as well as Catholic, victims of its bigotry and intolerance! It would seem that it is a crime for any *other* denomination to do what Presbyterians have never failed of doing *when they had the power*. I do not perceive by what *divine right* Presbyterians claim the MONOPOLY of persecution. If it be a privilege at all, which I deny, *Catholics* possessed the priority of title. *They* did not spring up in the 16th century of the Christian church, to dispute the faith of Protestants. But on the contrary, the Protestants then came into existence to dispute with them for something more than "the kingdom which is not of this world"—viz. for their churches, their castles, their towns, and their kingdoms. It is a fact, that at the rise of the Reformation, so called, Catholics possessed every thing; and that Protestants *as such* possessed nothing, save their private individual estates. How came they, then, to possess themselves of public power and property which did not belong to them? Did they give any equivalent? They had

none to give. Did the Catholics resign them *voluntarily?* No, certainly: if they had, they would have escaped the charge of *persecution.* They were in possession—*defence* was their *natural* privilege.—Kingdoms were tranquil and united in the profession of the same religion, whenever the heresy began, and the question was, whether it was the right of nations to extinguish the *spark*, or allow their institutions, civil and religious, to be consumed in the political conflagration which it never failed to excite. It was to illustrate this question, that Bellarmine embarked on the sea of political casuistry. He contended that the civil magistrates were, in the language of your standard of 1821, "nursing fathers of the church"—and it is a remarkable coincidence that he attempts to prove his position by reference to the *same texts* of Scripture by which the WESTMINSTER DIVINES, and the "adopting act of 1729," made it a *sin* for Presbyterians to "tolerate a false religion." * * * *

"But, reverend sir, if your forefathers and mine have done those things *in the name* of religion, which religion *does not sanction*, I would rather have joined you in walking backwards, to cover their deeds with the mantle of oblivion, than be obliged to join you in exposing them. Still, painful as the task is, you have made it necessary, and it must be accomplished.

"It is but right that I should begin with the Reformer of Geneva, Calvin himself. "Servetus," says he, "was cast into prison, whence he escaped, I know not how, and was wandering through Italy for about four months. At length, having, under evil auspices, come hither, he was arrested, AT MY INSTIGATION, by one of our Syndicts," (Calvini, Epist. et Respons. p. 294.) Again, (p. 290.) "The author (Servetus) is held in prison by our magistrates, and soon, I HOPE, to *suffer his punishment.*"

"In his letter to M. Du. Poet, he says of those who differed from him in the interpretation of the Bible, "*Pareils monstres doivent etre etouffes, comme fis ICI en l'execution de Michel Servet, Espagnol.*" That is, "They ought to be strangled, as was done HERE with the Spaniard, Michael Servetus."

"This gentle Reformer would have strangled (*etouffes*) Gentilis, Okin, Blaudrat, and others, if they had not either *fled* or *retracted;* which they were *obliged* to do—to save their lives. Melancthon, Bullinger, and the Protestant clergy of Switzerland generally, and in *solemn session approved of the faggot* which consumed Servetus.—Bucer declared that he should have been "torn limb from limb!"

"John Knox was ready to prove, "by the Prophets and plain Scriptures of God, what trees and generation they (the Catholics) be, *to wit*, unfruitful and rotten; *apt for nothing but to be cast into hell fire.*" (Appellation, p. 30.)

"Even the meek John Wesley, as late as the year 1780, proclaimed that "they (Catholics) ought not to be tolerated by any government, *Protestant, Mahometan*, or *Pagan.*"

"Let us now look for the mild, tolerant, evangelical language of Luther: "If," says he, in his book against Sylvester Prieras, "we de-

spatch thieves by the *gallows*, highwaymen by the *sword*, and *heretics* by *fire;* why do we not rather attack with *all kinds of arms* these monsters of perdition, these Cardinals, these Popes, and all this sink of the Romish Sodom, which corrupts, without ceasing, the church of God, and *wash our hands in their blood?*"

"In England the history of Protestant *toleration* has been written in statutes of similar tint. Protestants were burned alive for *heresy*, and Catholics "hanged, embowelled, and quartered," because they would not become Protestants. To deny the supremacy of Henry VIII., or of his daughter, when she became head of the church, was quite enough to entitle any one to all the privileges of *martyrdom.*

"Your old friend, Archbishop Usher, by way of showing his "authority among Romanists," entered a Catholic Chapel with armed soldiers, seized the Priest in his vestments, and hewed down the crucifix. He and eleven other Protestant Bishops solemnly decided that "to give them (Catholics) a toleration, or to consent that they may freely exercise their religion, *is a grievous sin.*" (Plowden, vol I. c. 4.) In 1642, the same Usher extorted a promise from Charles I. *never to connive at Popery*—and *on this intolerant pledge*, administered to him the Sacrament. (Birch, p. 278–9.) Poor Charles little imagined that his Presbyterian subjects would entitle *himself* to a place in the martyrology of Protestant persecution.

"But Presbyterians have persecuted greater men than *mere* kings. The learned Protestant, Grotius, in his dungeon, is an instance of it—in the Low Countries—where the Presbyterian Gomarists persecuted the Presbyterian Armenians with the most *deliberate* and unrelenting fury. If we turn our eyes to the Cromwellian ascendancy in Great Britain and Ireland, we shall see *what kind* of toleration Presbyterians practised. Dr. Taylor, (a Protestant A. B. of Trinity College,) tells us, "that they (Puritans) employed *blood-hounds* to track the haunts of these devoted men" (Catholic Priests.) And that "during the latter part of the 17th and beginning of the 18th century, '*Priest-hunting*' was a favorite field sport in Ireland." (See Hist. Ireland, vol. 2. p. 52. Harper's Family Library.)

"The Presbyterians, indeed, were themselves persecuted. But nothing could teach them mercy. The "Pilgrim Fathers," fleeing from intolerance across the ocean, had scarcely landed on the rock of Plymouth, till they began to persecute each other. They put the Quakers to death without pity, as "pestilent heretics." (Hist. of Bapt. in New England, vol. 1. page 329.) "Whipping," "branding," and "cutting off the right ear," were mitigated forms of punishment for the crime of heresy—that is, *for interpreting the Bible for themselves.* In a word, *show, in all history, a single instance*, in which Presbyterians possessed civil jurisdiction over ten square miles of the surface of this earth, without practising intolerance and persecution, within the limits of their territory! * * * *

"Now let Protestants see whether it is *becoming* in them to charge us with persecution. At the time of the Reformation, the faith, the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the civil power, the churches, the fortresses,

the cities, the kingdoms, the crowns—in a word, every thing belonged to Catholics. They could plead for their title the *prescription* of a thousand years. Supposing, then, we grant that in defending themselves in any, or all of these possessions, they were guilty of excesses, by how many considerations may these excesses be extenuated? But where shall we find the plea for *Protestant* intolerance? All their possessions, whether belonging to this world, or the world to come, were of recent origin, and acquired by the title of usurpation.—Yesterday they claimed *freedom of conscience;* and to-day, having *the power to refuse it*, they "hang," "embowel," and "quarter," or burn to death the wretch who acts upon their own principles!! If God has appointed, as the *rule of faith*, that every man shall understand the Scriptures for himself, then Servetus was as *justifiable* as Calvin in their interpretation. Why, then, did Calvin *burn* Servetus? On *that* principle, Servetus would have had quite as good a right to burn Calvin. Why did Henry VIII. the father of the Reformation in England, burn every body that stood in opposition to *his* religious *opinions*,—if the freedom of opinion be the right of all? Why did his Protestant daughter, Queen Elizabeth, the third head of the English church, why did *she* burn, and hang, and embowel, and quarter those who differed from *her opinions?*

"Why did the Rev. Mr. Wesley proclaim, in his writings, that not even "Turks or Pagans" were justified "in tolerating Roman Catholics?" Why did John Knox preach that Roman Catholics were "apt only for hell-fire;" and proclaim that it was the duty of the magistrates and people to put them to death? Why did Presbyterians put their fellow-Protestants to death in Geneva, England, and America? And these are the people who reproach Catholics with what does not belong either to the spirit or the letter of their religion—viz. the massacre of St. Bartholomew and the Inquisition!!

"Let honest and impartial Protestants, therefore, place these accounts side by side, and strike the balance between their ancestors and ours. Are you not, consequently, as unfortunate in appealing to *this* test, in favor of the Protestant rule of faith, as you have been in every other? * * * *

"But as the restrictions of Catholic states, on the liberty of the press, and prohibited books, seems to be a great hobby in all your letters—it may be proper for me to say, that Catholic states, like Protestant states, manage their national affairs pretty much as they please.—When Presbyterians, however, sat at the helm of civil government, they did not do much better. In those days it was a *sin to print* or *even* READ *the Episcopal Book of Common Prayer.* By an ordinance of the Presbyterian Parliament, dated August 23, 1645, "Any person using the Book of Common Prayer, forfeited, for the first *offence*, five pounds; for the second, ten; and for the third, *suffered imprisonment.* All Common Prayer Books in churches or chapels were ordered to be brought to the committee within a month, under the forfeit of *forty shillings for each book.*" [Rushworth, page 207.] By another ordinance, passed August 29, 1654, for the ejection of scandalous, ignor-

ant, and inefficient ministers and schoolmasters, it is enacted "that such ministers and schoolmasters shall be accounted *scandalous*, as have *publicly and frequently read the Common Prayer Book*," the reading of which was judged by this ordinance as great an offence as *drunkenness, fornication, adultery, perjury, or blasphemy*."

In extenuation of these Presbyterian persecutions and proscriptions we must say, that they learned this art of settling disputes (as they received various other traditions and notions) from the Mother Church; therefore, they who set the example have the greater sin.

EDITOR.

New Version Defended---No. 9.

MR. SMITH, *steady to his purpose*, next impugns the New Version on the charge of want of "*beauty and propriety*" in translating BAPTIZO *immerse*, &c. I see nothing else in the accusation; for he presumes not to allege that *immersion* is not the act which Jesus commanded, nor the fair and obvious meaning of the word But that the reader may judge for himself, we request him to hear Mr. Smith in all he has to object to the New Version on this account:—

"Another rule adopted by Mr. Campbell is, that the word *baptizo* and its compounds must always be rendered to *immerse*, &c. Let us examine two or three passages to see how this rule works.

"Mr. Campbell's version of Mark vii. 3—5. is as follows. "For the Pharisees and indeed all the Jews who observe the tradition of the elders eat not until they have washed their hands by pouring a little water upon them: and if they be come from the market, by dipping them; and many other usages there are which they have adopted, as immersions of cups and pots and brazen vessels and beds."

"In the phrase "by dipping them," the last word is supplied by the translator (who in this instance is Dr. Campbell) there being nothing to correspond with it in the original. The *literal* translation, word for word, is, "Except they *baptize*, they eat not." How was this *baptism* (or washing, as our translation properly enough has it,) performed? By the application of a small quantity of water to a part of the body, not by the immersion of the whole in water.

"In connexion with this we shall notice before we proceed to the latter part of the above passage, Luke xi. 38. which Mr. Campbell thus renders: "But the Pharisee was surprised to observe that he used no washing before dinner." The exact literal version of this sentence is also, "that he did not *baptize* before dinner." Mr. Campbell is obliged to admit that in this passage *baptizo* DOES NOT MEAN TO DIP, OR TO IMMERSE.

"The word in Mark vii. 4. which Mr. Campbell (after Dr. Campbell) translates *beds*, might with propriety be rendered *couches*, referring to those upon which persons in ancient times reclined at table. The whole passage has reference to things connected with the use or preparation of food. Now what sense does it make to speak of the immersion of *couches*, or, as our common version reads, of *tables*? The mode of baptism in view of the writer here was manifestly by *the pouring of water*, not by *immersion*.

"We think the use of the word *baptizo* in these passages entirely conclusive, for if it were commonly understood of immersing only, St. Mark and St. Luke have proved themselves strangely ignorant of the language in which they wrote. We think too that they prove this word to be used by them in

its common, familiar acceptation, otherwise some other expression would more readily have suggested itself to their minds.

"In Mr. Campbell's version of Acts i. 5. we read, "John indeed immersed in water, but you shall be immersed in the Holy Spirit within a few days." This is a strange expression, inappropriate in itself and inapplicable to the event of which it is a prophecy. "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence," said our Saviour. How? By the descent of the Spirit at Pentecost recorded in the following chapter, which St. Peter declared to the astonished multitude to be the fulfilment of the prophecy of Joel, "I will *pour out* of my Spirit upon all flesh" To be baptized with the Holy Ghost, appears in this connexion an appropriate figure, but in the dress which Mr. Campbell has given it we can see in it neither propriety nor beauty."

For the reputation of the Episcopal Church and the nineteenth century, (to say nothing of Mr. Smith's own personal reputation as a scholar,) we expected something better, or nothing at all on this subject.

Dr. Campbell is responsible for Mark vii. 3—5.—but Mr. Smith has done him great injustice in not giving his reasons for the words "*by dipping them*," and for the whole version of this passage. The reader need not to be informed that Dr. Campbell was not a Baptist, and therefore he must admit that the evidence in favor of immersion must have been *overwhelming* to constrain a Paidobaptist not merely to translate the word in dispute by *immerse;* but even to supply "*by dipping them*," when not in the original, in order to give the sense of a passage in which the word appears not well to suit. But this is not the only act of injustice done to this Paidobaptist Doctor. Mr. Smith asks the question with an air that indicates the exposure of Dr. Campbell—"How was this baptism performed? By the application of a small quantity of water to a part of the body, not by the immersion of the whole in water." Who says the *whole?* No person! It is an immersion of *the hands* only!! Mr. Smith, then, only reproaches his own intellect and sense of propriety by imputing to Dr. Campbell an error of his own creation!

Mr. Smith from the new version of Luke xi. 38. asserts very strangely, that in *one passage*, at least, I "have to admit that *baptizo* does not mean to dip or immerse." What then? To sprinkle or to pour?—! The reverse is the fact. Instead of admitting that it does not mean *immerse* in this instance, we contend that it does, but that the design of the writer is not to express the performance of an action, but figuratively to represent a religious custom of cleansing before meals, which the Messiah did not practise.

It would be a disgrace to the age and to the Episcopal Church of England should we have seriously to attempt to prove that every word in language is used figuratively, and that it is ridiculous to contend that because a word is sometimes used figuratively, its figurative and literal import are always identical.

That the least gifted head in christendom may discern this *trick* of the Rev. Mr. Smith, I will make a comparison and an illustration from a case that cannot be perverted. The word *God*, in the Holy Scriptures, *literally* means the Creator and Governor of the World.

Not even Mr. Smith will deny this. But suppose some one, as captious and crooked as himself, should take it into his head to deny this, asserting that it literally means a *man;* what answer would Mr. Smith give to such a caviller, who would quote Exod. vii. 1. "And the Lord said to Moses, I have made thee a *god* to Pharoah," in proof that *God* literally and properly signified a *man?!* His answer to such a person will exactly suit himself in this case.

Washing, cleansing, purifying, &c. naturally and morally express no specific action whatever. Any of these words may express the effect of immersion, of pouring, and perhaps of sprinkling, though I know of no nation, family, or individual who washes by sprinkling. Such an institution for personal, domestic, or culinary use would deserve a patent for at least 28 years ——It would save an immense labor!

I would here refer Mr. Smith to the Appendix to the Family Testament, pp. 85 and 86, on the words *baptize* and *baptism*, with a single remark, that *the fact being admitted* which we have there asserted, (and *he cannot deny it*—I will go farther, and predict that *he will not deny it*,) it is put beyond dispute that neither sprinkling nor pouring is indicated by *baptize*, and that he that has had water only sprinkled or poured upon him has never been baptized. *No translator of the Scriptures in any age, language, or dialect, has* ONCE *translated these words by* SPRINKE *or* POUR. All have occasionally translated them by *immerse* or its representative, but none by *sprinkle* or *pour*, or their representatives.

His criticism, if so it may be called, on the *baptism* of cups and couches, has been exploded a thousand times. If they sprinkled the cups in cleansing them, they sprinkled also the couches, or tables. If they immersed the one, they immersed the other. Like Adam after he had sinned, these Doctors of sprinkling are fond of the *thicket.* Under the shade of Jewish customs and obsolete usages they feel they can make the best retreat from the gaze of the vulgar. You will never find them on the banks of the Jordan, nor within a hundred miles of Enon, nor yet at any river, pond, or bath ankle-deep.

Perhaps Horne or some other good orthodox critic might help Mr. Smith to understand these rabbinnical usages alluded to Mark vii. 3. 4.—see vol. 3, p. 326. "Two sorts of washing had the Jews," says the Doctor. "One, of the whole body by *immersion*—the other, of the hands and feet, called *dipping* or *pouring water*, and which was of daily use, not only for the hands and feet, but also for the cups and other vessels used at meals." The two *dippings*, leaving out the *pouring* part, is at least two to one, Paidobaptists themselves being judges, in favor of immersion, even in this *thicket of Jewish traditions!*

I think in all honesty Mr. Smith will concede to me, that, taking the best and most popular commentary now in use in the Episcopal Church of the United States and of England—I mean that of D'oyly and Mant, "Domestic Chaplains to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury," and "published under the direction of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge," London; and republished in America,

improved by John Henry Hobart, D. D. Bishop of the Protestant Church in the State of New York, for a fair expose of the views of the Bishops, Doctors, and dignitaries of his own church, that even in that work I have an overwhelming weight of authority in favor of the new version of this said *baptizo*, and indeed of all my views of primitive christianity. I want no other book than this very learned and comprehensive commentary, triumphantly to sustain me against all such assaults as that of my editorial friend, Mr. Smith of the Recorder.

I would not, indeed, be understood as approving in the wholesale that most learned and best of commentaries; for in it are found many of the frailties of the Protestant Church; but one thing I will say, that in it I find the clear and definite concession of all my cardinal sentiments and views, by the brightest heads and most illustrious critics and interpreters in the Episcopal Church. This will do me no credit with Baptists or Presbyterians, and perhaps not much with Mr. Smith himself; yet I think it due to the times and to Mr. Smith to say this much, and to inform him that when I want documents to brush off the Philadelphia cobwebs which obstruct and impair his vision, I shall bring them from this quarter—from the most manly, learned, and honest of the Doctors and Rabbis of the Church of St. Martin, who are acknowledged in his church to be the best interpreters both of the Bible and of the Thirty-nine Articles.

It is but a puerile objection, yet I had better notice that Mr. Smith places the "immersion in the Holy Spirit" in contrast with "the baptism with the Holy Ghost" as very inappropriate and inelegant. And what is "the baptism of the Holy Spirit?" The sprinkling with—the pouring with—the Holy Spirit! Is not this quite appropriate! Can any one imagine such a thing without a circumlocution! But so long as a person may be immersed in water, in fire, in air, in trouble, or in debt, without any unnatural use of the word or violence of speech, the Apostles and first converts being overwhelmed, covered, filled with the Holy Spirit, may be appropriately said to have been immersed in the Holy Spirit.

It is strange that Mr. Smith should have chosen all his arguments from the metaphorical use of the word, and not once have approached the places where this institution was practised, nor the circumstances attendant on it, such as the going down into, and the coming up from, or out of the water, &c. &c.

It is a sound canon of criticism, that if a definition be correct, it will always make good sense to substitute the definition for the term defined. Take all the places where this institution is circumstantially spoken of, and experiment a little in this way, and then resist the light if you can! Substitute *sprinkle* or *pour*, beginning with Matth. iii. to the end of the Acts of Apostles, in all places where *baptize* is found, and then try *immerse*. In this way an ounce of common sense will out-balance a ton of such logic and criticism as Mr. Smith has to offer:———

Jesus was sprinkled in the Jordan! Jesus was poured in the Jordan! &c. I cannot condescend to trace it farther. I hope no one will

think I am going into the merits of this question. I must have something of merit opposed to me before I can condescend to fight this battle over again. The inquisitive may consult my Debates on Baptism, the Notes and Tables to the Family Testament, who are not satisfied with the preceding cursory remarks.

Mr. Smith, a word for your ear, if you please: You have the same authority from your Judge for sprinkling *bells* and *graveyards*, for the oil and the spittle of his impious Holiness, as you have for sprinkling speechless babes or infidel adults. And for your thus acting *in the name of the Lord* when he did not command you, you must answer to Jesus Christ, and not to Alexander Campbell.

EDITOR.

Hear a Converted Infidel.

DR. JOHN D. GODMAN, a name dear to all the lovers of science, who died in Germantown, Pennsylvania, in 1830, was formerly an infidel. His sentiments were formed in the school of the French naturalists of the last century, and, to use his own words, he was "*an established infidel*, rejecting revelation, and casting all the evidences of an existing Deity beneath his feet." In a letter to a friend, written in December 1828, he observes, "I am no theologian, and have as great an aversion to priestcraft as one can entertain. I was once an infidel, as I told you in the West Indies. I became a Christian from conviction produced by the candid inquiry recommended to you. I know of no other way in which death can be stripped of its terrors; certainly none better can be wished." Christians may well regard with satisfaction the life and death of this eminent man. Perhaps the best memorial of him which we can give our readers, is the following extract from a short essay written just before his death, on the authenticity of the gospel of Christ:—

"Is proof wanting that these gospels are true? It is only necessary for an honest mind to read them candidly to be convinced. Every occurrence is stated clearly, simply, and unostentatiously. The narrations are not supported by asseverations of their truth, nor by parade of witnesses; the circumstances described took place in presence of vast multitudes, and are told in that downright unpretending manner, which would have called forth innumerable positive contradictions, had they been untrue. Mysteries are stated without attempt at explanation, because *explanation* is not necessary to establish the *existence* of facts, however mysterious. Miracles, also, attested by the presence of vast numbers, are stated in the plainest language of narration, in which the slightest working of imagination can be traced. This very simplicity, this unaffected sincerity, and quiet affirmation, have more force than a thousand witnesses—more efficacy than volumes of ambitious effort to support truth by dint of argumentation.

What motive could the evangelists have to falsify? The Christian kingdom is not *of this world*, nor *in it*. Christianity teaches disregard

of its vanities; depreciates its honors and enjoyments, and sternly declares that none can be Christians but those who escape its vices and allurements. There is no call directed to ambition—no gratification proposed to vanity; the sacrifice of self; the denial of all the propensities which relate to the gratification of passion or pride, with the most humble dependence upon God, are invariably taught, and most solemnly enjoined.

What is the mode in which this most extraordinary doctrine of Christianity is to be diffused? By force, temporal power, temporal rewards, earthly triumphs? None of these. By earnest persuasion, gentle entreaty, brotherly monition, paternal remonstrance. The dread resort of threatened punishment comes last—exhibited in sorrow, not in anger; told as a fearful truth, not denounced with vindictive exultation; while, to the last moment, the beamy shield of mercy is ready to be interposed for the saving of the endangered.

Human doctrines are wavering and mutable; the doctrines of the blessed and adorable Jesus, our Saviour, are fixed and immutable. The traditions of men are dissimilar and inconsistent; the declarations of the Gospel are harmonious, not only with each other, but with the acknowledged attributes of the Deity, and the well known condition of human nature.

What do sceptics propose to give us in exchange for this system of Christianity, with its 'hidden mysteries,' 'miracles,' 'signs and wonders!' Doubt, confusion, obscurity, annihilation! Life, without higher motive than selfishness, death—without hope! It is for this that their zeal is so warmly displayed in proselyting? Is such the gain to accrue for the relinquishment of our souls? In very deed, this is the utmost they have to propose, and we can only account for their rancorous efforts to render others like themselves by reflecting *that mysery loves company.*" [*Philadelphia Gazette.*]

Conversations in Father Goodal's Family Circle, at Mr. Reed's.

[*Continueed from page* 321.]

Mr. Reed. OUR friend Williamson is in a great agony of mind. He replies to all my explanations and exhortations, "I have no confidence in myself—I have so often slighted the voice of Christ, and done violence to my own conscience and feelings, that I cannot hope for acceptance, even were I now to give up to my convictions. Besides," he adds, "I know nothing which I could do, except what I have already done. I have prayed and wrestled, and reformed, and again sinned and repented, and joined in all acts of worship except the communion. I have had my occasional fits of despair and alternations of hope, and then, for a season, great earnestness and zeal; but now I feel myself as wretched as ever, and think that I have never found the ark of safety." Will Father Goodal talk with him a little?

Father Goodal. I have no new gospel to preach to him. The *truth* from brother Reed is just as forcible as from Father Goodal; but I will go and see him.

Mr. Reed. I am often perplexed with questions which I cannot answer from the Scriptures. The New Testament affords no occurrence similar to that

which happened this evening. I do not, therefore, know whether we ought to apply to such cases answers which the Apostles gave to persons in other circumstances, and whose cases were in no respect parallel.

Mr. Cunningham. Does not the Philippian Jailor furnish a model for all such cases? I generally hear all our clergy give the answer which Paul gave to the Jailor, to all who ask what they ought to do to be saved.

Mr. Reed. This is the general custom in this country as in Scotland; but for some years past I have doubted its propriety.

Mr. Payne. And in England too, I have always heard it from every pulpit—from that of the Bishop of London down to the Whitfieldian Methodists, and the Ministers of Lady Huntingdon's Chapels, who are the very paragons of orthodoxy among Dissenters.

Mr. Reed. Gentlemen, you can easily overpower me with votes and great names, and it is with reluctance I ever differ from the great, and wise, and good; but so long as I am a responsible agent, and have the example of multitudes reputed great, and wise, and good, erring in some matters which we all now disclaim as the most palpable misconceptions, I am admonished to take nothing upon mere authority, and my conscience will not justify me in approving any thing which I cannot for myself understand from the plenipotentiaries of Jesus and the stewards of the mysteries of heaven.

Mr. Cunningham. Will Mr. Reed have the goodness to explain wherein differs the case of the Jailor and other sinners, and why the advice given by Paul to one sinner will not suit every other sinner?

Mr. Reed. All sinners are not in similar circumstances, under the same administration of the divine government, are not equal in their opportunities even under the same economy of Heaven; and to me it would appear as inconsiderate and as *mal appropos* to give the same answer to every sinner who asks the same question, as it would be for a Physician to give the same answer to every patient who asked him, 'What shall I do to recover health?'

Mr. Cunningham. But are we authorized to think that the moral diseases of the mind are as various and complex as those of the body?

Mr. Reed. It seems not to affect the subject whether or not they are exactly as various and numerous—certain it is, that the diseases of the mind are numerous and diverse; and give me leave to ask you, Would you place Mr. Williamson and the Jailor side by side, and regard the one as fitly and fully representative of the other?

Mr. Cunningham. So far as they are *sinners*, I should suppose that their *state* is the same, though their *characters* might differ.

Mr. Reed. True; as sinners they are in the same state of condemnation and alienation from God; but as respects ignorance and the opportunities of knowledge, there is a great difference; and as the question "*What shall I do?*" acknowledges ignorance in the querist, I judge that before the question is answered the ignorance or intelligence of the querist is to be first noted, and the answer shaped accordingly.

Mr. Cunningham. Then the Scriptures are not adapted to all ages of the world, nor to all classes of men, if we are not to give a latitude to such questions and answers greatly beyond the circumstances of the particular persons and things which occasioned them.

Mr. Reed. Perhaps this may not be a fair inference, because the questions and answers found in the Record are not the only means of instruction which that book contains. These are rather but detailed applications of the principles inculcated in the Living Oracles.

Mr. Cunningham. Of this I am not so good a judge; but I have usually understood that the answers given to such important questions stood in the relation of general principles, and thus furnished instruction to all ages.

Mr. Reed. To understand this matter fully, would it not be advantageous to have before us the question, *What shall I do?* in all its various occurrences in the New Testament?

Mr. Cunningham. To me it will be a gratification; for, indeed, I have

looked perhaps without any examination to the Jailor's case as the only one that had any bearings upon us.

Mr. Reed. Will Robert Fowler bring the Concordance from the library, and inform us how often the phrase occurs in the New Testament?

Robert Fowler. I find the phrase only *eight* times in the New Testament, not exactly the same in all places, but I presume it is substantially the same.

Mr. Cunningham. Please read them all, with the answers.

Robert Fowler. Matth. xix. 16. "What *good* must I do to obtain eternal life? Jesus replied, *Keep the commandments?*"

Luke iii. 10. "The multitude asked John, What must we do then? To produce good fruit, or to reform as the context reads. John replies, Let him that has two coats impart to him that has none; and let him that has victuals do the same."

Luke iii. 12. "There came also publicans to be baptized, who said, Master, what must we do? He answered, Exact no more than what is appointed you."

Luke iii. 14. "Soldiers likewise asked him, And what must we do? He answered, Injure no man, either by violence, or false accusation, and be content with your allowance."

Acts ii. 37. "And the convicted Jews said to Peter and the rest of the Apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? And Peter said to them, Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins."

Acts xvi. 30. "Sirs, said the Jailor, what must I do to he saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved and thy house."

Acts xxii. 1. "And I [Paul] said, What shall I do, Lord? And the Lord said to me, Arise and go to Damascus, and there it shall be told thee of all things which are appointed for thee to do."

The other passages where this phrase occurs, respect other matters; such as the steward who was to be turned out of his stewardship, &c.

Mr. Cunningham. This I confess makes the matter more difficult; for it would seem that in some instances where the question is the same the answer is different. But, Mr. Reed, do you consider all these questions as relating to the same subject?

Mr. Reed. Not to the same subject. The first had respect to some *good* work in order to eternal life, proposed by a young man to the Saviour. Three of the remaining examples were persons desirous of reforming according to the preaching of John. But it is worthy of remark that John gives a different answer to the same question proposed by the promiscuous multitude, by the publicans, and by the soldiers. Of the three remaining cases, which occurred after the Apostles received their commission to convert the world, all found in the Acts of the Apostles, I presume they all respect the same thing.

Mr. Cunningham. And do not they all receive the same answer?

Mr. Reed. It appears not. The multitude of convicted Jews were commanded to repent and be baptized; the Jailor was told to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ; and Saul of Tarsus was told to do something else——What was it, Robert?

Robert Fowler. To go to Damascus.

Mr. Reed. And is that all?

Robert Fowler. I must read the passage again:—"Go to Damascus, and there it shall be told you all things that are appointed for you to do."

Mr. Reed. You must go to Damascus also, Robert, to find this matter out.

Robert Fowler. And where shall I find what was appointed to Paul in Damascus?

Mr. Reed. Pursue the narrative.

Robert Fowler. I see that Ananias was sent to Paul, and after explaining the object of his call by the Lord in person, he commands him (verse 16) to "arise and be baptized and wash away his sins, calling upon the name of the Lord."

Mr. Reed. These three instances, then, give a different view of the matter,

and this explains all that I meant by addressing persons in harmony with their circumstances.

Mr. Cunningham. And what differences do you find in these three classes, Mr. Reed? Were they not all sinners?

Mr. Reed. They were all sinners. But the multitude of Jews, mentioned Acts ii. were believing convicted sinners. The Jailor was an ignorant, alarmed, panic stricken sinner; and Paul, when addressed by Ananias, was a believing penitent sinner.

Mr. Cunningham. And is our friend Mr. Williamson's case unlike the seven which have been read to us?

Mr. Reed. Yes, in my judgment, his case differs from each and every one of these. The reason why it appears so is, that not any one of the seven answers given by authority to these seven questions will relieve him or reach his case. If I say to him, 'Believe,' he replies, 'I do believe.' If I say, 'Repent,' he says, 'I have repented, and do repent.' If I say, 'Be baptized,' he replies, 'I was baptized.' If I remind him of what John or Jesus said to those who interrogated them, he responds, 'All these occurred before the commission was given to preach the glad tidings to every creature. I am not a Pharisee, nor a publican, nor a soldier.' He has heard all that was preached by Peter, Paul, James, John—all the Apostles; assents to it all, doubts neither the person nor the mission of the Messiah, acknowledges the whole Christian Institution; and yet he does not consider himself a Christian—enjoys no peace of conscience, and has no hope in God. Can you find a case of this sort in all the New Testament? I think I cannot!

Mr. Cunningham. I am not, I confess, skilled incasuistry. Perhaps all that is necessary in his case is to partake of the sacrament. If he believe, repent, and is yet unhappy, it must arise from his neglect of this *sealing ordinance.*

Mr. Reed. None but those who have peace with God, through Jesus Christ our Lord, and rejoice in the hope of his coming, can acceptably or rationally commemorate his sufferings and show forth his death.

Mrs. Fowler. There is some great error in the world. I do not know what it is. I never read of a doubting, fearing, trembling Christian in the New Testament. Too much confidence seems to have been a more natural error than too little, especially after there was a full development of the Reign of Grace. There is some mystery hanging over the Christian Institution, which seems to bewilder and distract many professors, and which keeps many sensible persons from making a profession of the Christian faith.

Mr. Reed. I never was so confounded in any case which presented itself to me. It would seem from all my conversation with Mr. Williamson, that he is a believing unbeliever, a penitent impenitent, a baptized unbaptized, an obedient disobedient, a professing non-professor of Jesus Christ.

Father Goodal. I have only succeeded in convincing Mr. Williamson that all his mental troubles have arisen from disobedience to the faith, and this has led him to examine whether he has in truth believed the testimony of God. Of this he is so far doubtful as to affirm that he never did understandingly believe it. Upon the whole, I presume it is better to leave him some time to his own reflections.

Mr. Reed. I am more than ever convinced myself, Father Goodal, that we are but children in the word of God. I do not think we have kept faith, repentance, obedience in their proper place, or regarded them in their true character and tendency.

Father Goodal. Ah! my dear brother, there is too much science or philosophy, falsely so called, mingled with the gospel. The word of God is made of non-effect by an empty philosophy. Lord, restore a pure speech to Zion!

EDITOR.

Power of Prayer.

"The inwrought prayer of a righteous man avails much."

ABRAHAM'S servant prays—Rebekah appears. Jacob wrestles, and prays, and prevails with God. Esau's mind is wonderfully turned from the revengeful purpose he had harbored for twenty years. Moses cries to God—the sea divides. Moses prays—Amalek is discomfited. Joshua prays—Achan is discovered. Hannah prays—Samuel is born. David prays—Ahithopel hangs himself. Asa prays—a victory is gained. Jehosophat cries to God—God turns away his foes. Isaiah and Hezekiah pray—one hundred and eighty-five thousand Assyrians are dead in twelve hours. Daniel prays—the dream is revealed. Daniel prays—the lions are muzzled. Daniel prays—the seventy weeks are revealed. Mordecai and Esther fast—Haman is hanged on his own gallows in three days. Ezra prays at Ahava—God answers. Nehemiah darts a prayer—the king's heart is softened in a minute. Elijah prays—a drought of three years succeeds. Elijah prays—rain descends apace. Elisha prays—Jordan is divided. Elisha prays—a child's soul comes back; for prayer reaches eternity. The church prays ardently—Peter is delivered by an angel.

[*J. Ryland, A. M.*]

Dr. Watt's Testimony

In favor of the need of Reformation, and a more thorough knowledge of the Sacred Writings.

———'NOR should a student of divinity imagine that our ageis arrived at a full understanding of every thing which can be known by the Scriptures. Every age since the Reformation has thrown some further light on difficult texts and paragraphs of the Bible, which have been long obscured by the early rise of Antichrist: and since there are at present many difficulties and darknesses hanging about certain truths of Christian religion, and since several of these relate to important doctrines, such as the origin of sin, the fall of Adam, the person of Christ, the blessed Trinity, and the decrees of God, &c. which do still embarrass the minds of honest and inquiring readers, and which make work for noisy controversy; it is certain there are several things in the Bible yet unknown, and not sufficiently explained; and it is certain that there is some way to solve these difficulties, and to reconcile these seeming contradictions. And why not a sincere searcher of truth in the present age, by labor, diligence, study, and prayer, with the best use of his reasoning powers, find out the proper solution of those knots and perplexities which have hitherto been unsolved, and which have afforded matter for angry quarrelling? Happy is every man who shall be favored of Heaven to give a helping hand towards the introduction of the blessed age of light and love!"

Present State of the Presbyterian Denomination.

THE impotency of human creeds to preserve unity of opinion and co-operation, and to wage a successful war against innovation, whether of truth or error, is now being fully proved the thousandth time, in a very clear, full, and convincing manner, by this learned, ambitious, and powerful confederacy, called "*the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church.*" The Westminster Creed, so often amended and reformed, together with the constitutional regulations of American Presbyterians, is no longer able to keep out the heresy of new opinions, whether true or false. The spirit of the age, in defiance of this contravalation of mystic divinity, these massy gates, and bars, and locks of real heresy, has appeared on the very floor of the General Assembly, and raised an alarming clinking and hammering among the manacles, fetters, and chains of antiquated orthodoxy.

Our readers for the last ten or twelve years need not now be reminded of our predictions of the fortunes of this said creed—not that we make any pretensions to the spirit of prophecy, other than the prophecy which arises from the knowledge of the past, and the unchangeable tendency of things. I think, however, in verification of these anticipations, and in support of our reasonings upon the creed question, as well as in demonstration of the *progress of reform*, the following "*Act and Testimony*," long as it is, of the minority (as is supposed) of the last Assembly, deserves to be filed on our pages, and carefully read by all who are studious of the signs of the times.

The leprosy of error (or of the new school) it is said has spread over the majority of the whole Presbyterian body; and *W. L. M'Calla*, of Kentucky memory, is now, I learn, the second best man, next to *Dr. Green* himself, on the side of the ancient order of things in the Presbyterian church—that is, the reformed order of 1642. Calvin's Institutes are still with him and a few others the paragon of true orthodoxy--"The church in all ages claimed to herself the *right* of changing the ordinances somewhat, excepting the substance."

The Seven Doctrinal Errors imputed to the New School, I believe as far as I do Dr. Silas M. Noel's Thirty-nine Articles, which he collected and published for my creed. The reader will remember that these Seven Doctrines are from the crucible of the opposition, from which, in all cases, he must subtract the one half for alloy—the half of the other half for coloring matter, privily introduced, to enhance the value of orthodoxy; and then from the remainder he may form some imperfect idea of the true state of the case. The object of this "Act and Testimony" is to rally the forces in favor of the Westminster Theology against the New School, so that the lines between the two parties may be drawn clearly and fully next session. Such, at least, are my conjectures. One thing is certain—the reform party has passed the Rubicon. There is too much light, and liberty of conscience, its handmaid, elicited, to suffer them to tabernacle in the tents of Calvin and Knox; but whether they may pitch their tents in Chaldea or in Canaan, *Time*, that great revealer of secrets, will tell.

Ed. M. H.

From the Presbyterian.

ACT AND TESTIMONY.

To the Ministers, Elders, and private Members of the Presbyterian Church in the United States.

Brethren beloved in the Lord,

IN the solemn crisis, to which our church has arrived, we are constrained to appeal to you in relation to the alarming errors which have hitherto been connived at, and now at length have been countenanced and sustained by the acts of the supreme judicatory of our church.

Constituting, as we all do, a portion of yourselves, and deeply concerned, as every portion of the system must be, in all that affects the body itself, we earnestly addressed ourselves to you, in the full belief that the dissolution of our church, or what is worse, its corruption in all that once distinguished its peculiar testimony, can, under God, be prevented only by you.

From the highest judicatory of our church, we have for several years in succession sought the redress of our grievances, and have not only sought in vain, but with an aggravation of the evils of which we have complained. Whither, then, can we look for relief, but first to him who is made head over all things, to the church which is his body, and then to you, as constituting a part of that body, and as instruments in his hand to deliver the church from the oppression which she sorely feels.

We love the Presbyterian church, and look back with sacred joy to her instrumentality in promoting every good and every noble cause among men; to her unwavering love of human rights; to her glorious efforts for the advancement of human happiness; to her clear testimonies for the truth of God, and her great and blessed efforts to enlarge and establish the kingdom of Christ our Lord. We delight to dwell on the things which our God has wrought by our beloved church; and by his grace enabling us, we are resolved that our children shall not have occasion to weep over an unfaithfulness which permitted us to stand idly by, and behold the ruin of this glorious structure.

"Brethren," says the Apostle, "I beseech you by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you, but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment." In the presence of that Redeemer by whom Paul adjures us, we avow our fixed adherence to those standards of doctrine and order, in their obvious and intended sense, which we have heretofore subscribed under circumstances the most impressive. In the same spirit we do therefore solemnly acquit ourselves in the sight of God, of all responsibility arising from the existence of those divisions and disorders in our church, which spring from a disregard of assumed obligations, a departure from doctrines deliberately professed, and a subversion of forms publicly and repeatedly approved. By the same high authority, and under the same weighty sanctions, we do avow our fixed purpose to strive for the restoration of purity, peace, and scriptural order to our church; and to endeavor to exclude from her communion those who disturb her peace, corrupt her testimony, and subvert her established forms. And to the end that the doctrinal errors of which we complain may be fully known, and the practical evils under which the body suffers be clearly set forth, and our purposes in regard to both be distinctly understood, we adopt this Act and Testimony.

As regards Doctrine.

1. We do bear our solemn testimony against the right claimed by many, of interpreting the doctrines of our standards in a sense different from the general sense of the church for years past, whilst they still continue in our communion: on the contrary, we aver, that they who adopt our standards, are bound by candor and the simplest integrity, to hold them in their obvious, accepted sense.

2. We testify against the unchristian subterfuge to which some have recourse, when they avow a general adherence to our standards *as a system*, while they deny doctrines essential to the system, or hold doctrines at complete variance with the system.

3. We testify against the reprehensible conduct of those in our communion, who hold, and preach, and publish Arminian and Pelagian heresies, professing at the same time to embrace our creed, and pretending that these errors do consist therewith.

4. We testify against the conduct of those, who, while they profess to approve and adopt our doctrine and order, do, nevertheless, speak and publish, in terms, or by necessary implication, that which is derogatory to both, and which tends to bring both into disrepute.

5. We testify against the following as a part of the errors which are held and taught by many persons in our church.

Errors.

1. *Our relation to Adam.*—That we have no more to do with the first sin of Adam than with the sins of any other parent.

2. *Native Depravity.*—That there is no such thing as original sin: that infants come into the world as perfectly free from corruption of nature as Adam was when he was created: that by original sin nothing more is meant than the fact that all the posterity of Adam, though born entirely free from moral defilement, will always begin to sin when they begin to exercise moral agency, and that this fact is some how connected with the fall of Adam.

3. *Imputation.*—That the doctrine of imputed sin and imputed righteousness is a novelty, and is nonsense.

4. *Ability.*—That the impenitent sinner is by nature, and independently of the aid of the Holy Spirit, in full possession of all the powers necessary to a compliance with the commands of God: and that if he labored under any kind of inability, natural or moral, which he could not remove himself, he would be excusable for not complying with God's will.

5. *Regeneration.*—That man's regeneration is his own act; that it consists merely in the change of our governing purpose, which change we must ourselves produce.

6. *Divine Influence.*—That God cannot exert such an influence on the minds of men as shall make it certain that they will choose and act in a particular manner without destroying their moral agency, and that, in a moral system, God could not prevent the existence of sin, or the present amount of sin, however much he might desire it.

7. *Atonement.*—That Christ's sufferings were not truly and properly vicarious.—

Which doctrines and statements are dangerous and heretical, contrary to the gospel of God, and inconsistent with our Confession of Faith. We are painfully alive also to the conviction that unless a speedy remedy be applied to the abuses which have called forth this act and testimony, our theological seminaries will soon be converted into nurseries to foster the noxious errors which are already so widely prevalent, and our church funds will be perverted from the design for which they were originally contributed.

As regards Discipline.

The necessary consequence of the propagation of these similar errors among us, has been the agitation and division of our churches, and ecclesiastical bodies; the separation of our ministers, elders, and people into distinct parties; and the great increase of causes of mutual alienation.

Our people are no longer as one body of Christians; many of our church sessions are agitated by the tumultuous spirit of party; our presbyteries are convulsed by collisions growing out of the heresies detailed above, and our synods and our Assembly are made theatres for the open display of humiliating scenes of human passion and weakness. Mutual confidence is weakened; respect for the supreme judicatory of our church is impaired; our hope that the

dignified and impartial course of justice would flow steadily onward, has expired; and a large portion of the religious press is made subservient to error. The ordinary course of discipline, arrested by compromises, in which the truth is always loser, and perverted by organized combinations to personal, selfish, and party ends, ceases altogether, and leaves every one to do what seems good in his own eyes. The discipline of the church, rendered more needful than ever before, by the existence of numberless cases, in which Christian love to erring brethren, as well as a just regard to the interests of Zion, imperiously call for its prompt, firm, and temperate exercise, is absolute-prevented by the operation of the very causes which demand its employment. At the last meeting of the General Assembly, a respectful memorial presented in behalf of eleven presbyteries, and many sessions and individual members of our church, was treated without one indication of kindness, or the manifestation of any disposition to concede a single request that was made. It was sternly frowned upon, and the memorialists were left to mourn under their grievances, with no hope of alleviation from those who ought to have at least shown tenderness and sympathy, as the nursing fathers of the church, even when that which was asked was refused to the petitioners. At the same time they, who have first corrupted our doctrines, and then deprived us of the ordinary means of correcting the evils they have produced, seek to give permanent security to their errors and to themselves, by raising an outcry in the churches against all who love the truth well enough to contend for it.

Against this unusual, unhappy, and ruinous condition, we bear our clear and decided testimony in the presence of the God of all living; we do declare our firm belief that it springs primarily from the fatal heresies countenanced in our body; and we do avow our deliberate purpose, with the help of God, to give our best endeavors to correct it.

As regards Church Order.

We believe that the form of Government of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, is, in all essential features, in full accordance with the revealed will of God; and therefore whatever impairs its purity, or changes its essential character, is repugnant to the will of our Master. In what light then shall we be considered, if professing to revere this system, we calmly behold its destruction, or connive at the conduct of those engaged in tearing up its deep foundations?

Some of us have long dreaded the spirit of indifference to the peculiarities of our church order, which we supposed was gradually spreading amongst us. And the developments of later years have rendered it most certain, that as the perversion of our doctrinal formularies, and the engrafting of new principles and practices upon our church constitution, have gone hand in hand; so the original purity of the one cannot be restored without a strict and faithful adherence to the other. Not only then for its own sake, do we love the constitution of our church, as a model of all free institutions, and as a clear and noble exhibition of the soundest principles of civil and religious liberty; not only do we venerate its peculiarities, because they exhibit the rules by which God intends the affairs of his church on earth to be conducted; but we cling to its venerable ramparts, because they afford a sure defence for those precious, though despised doctrines of grace, the pure transmission of which has been entrusted as a sacred duty to the church.

It is therefore with the deepest sorrow that we behold our church tribunals, in various instances, imbued with a different spirit, and fleeing on every emergency to expedients unknown to the Christian simplicity and uprightness of our forms, and repugnant to all our previous habits. It is with pain and distrust that we see, sometimes, the helpless inefficiency of mere advisory bodies contended for and practised, when the occasion called for the free action of our laws; and sometimes the full and peremptory exercise of power, almost despotic, practised in cases where no authority existed to act at all. It is with increasing alarm that we behold a fixed design to organize new tribunals upon

principles repugnant to our system, and directly subversive of it, for the obvious purpose of establishing and propagating the heresies already recounted, of shielding from just process the individuals who hold them, and of arresting the wholesome discipline of the church. We do therefore testify against all these departures from the true principles of our Constitution; against the formation of new presbyteries and synods, otherwise than upon the established rules of our church; or for other purposes than the edification and enlargement of the church of Christ; and we most particularly testify against the formation of any tribunal, in our church, upon what some call principles of elective affinity; against the exercise by the General Assembly of any power not clearly delegated to it; and the exercise even of its delegated powers for purposes inconsistent with the design of its creation.

Recommendation to the Churches.

Dear Christian Brethren, you who love Jesus Christ in sincerity and in truth, and adhere to the plain doctrines of the cross as taught in the standards prepared by the Westminster Assembly, and constantly held by the true Presbyterian church; to all of you who love your ancient and pure Constitution, and desire to restore our abused and corrupted church to her simplicity, purity, and truth—we, a portion of yourselves, ministers and elders of your churches, and servants of one common Lord, would propose, most respectfully and kindly, and yet most earnestly—

1. That we refuse to give countenanse to ministers, elders, agents, editors, teachers, or to those who are in any other capacity engaged in religious instruction or effort, who hold the preceding or similar heresies.

2. That we make every lawful effort to subject all such persons, especially if they be ministers, to the just exercise of discipline by the proper tribunal.

3. That we use all proper means to restore the discipline of the church, in all its courts, to a sound, just, Christian state.

4. That we use our endeavors to prevent the introduction of new principles into our system, and to restore our tribunals to their ancient purity.

5. That we consider the presbyterial existence or acts of any presbytery or synod formed upon the principles of elective affinity, as unconstitutional, and all ministers and churches voluntarily included in such bodies as having virtually departed from the standards of our church.

6. We recommend that all ministers, elders, church sessions, presbyteries, and synods, who approve of this act and testimony, give their public adherence thereto, in such manner as they shall prefer, and communicate their names; and when a church court, a copy of their adhering act.*

7. That inasmuch as our only hope of improvement and reformation in the affairs of our church depends on the interposition of him who is King of Zion, that we will unceasingly and importunately supplicate a Throne of Grace for the return of that purity and peace, the absence of which we now sorrowfully deplore.

8. We do earnestly recommend that on the second Thursday of May, 1835, a convention be held in the city of Pittsburg, to be composed of two delegates, a minister and ruling elder from each presbytery, or from the minority of any presbytery, who may concur in the sentiments of this act and testimony, to deliberate and consult on the present state of our church, and to adopt such measures as may be best suited to restore her prostrated standards.

And now, brethren, our whole heart is laid open to you, and to the world. If the majority of our church are against us, they will, we suppose, in the end, either see the infatuation of their course, and retrace their steps, or they will at last attempt to cut us off. If the former, we shall bless the God of Jacob; if the latter, we are ready for the sake of Christ, and in support of the testimony now made, not only to be cut off, but if need be, to die also. If on the other hand, the body be yet in the main, sound, as we would fondly hope, we have

* *They can be forwarded to the Office of the Presbyterian, No. 9, George street, Philadelphia.*

here, frankly, openly, and candidly, laid before our erring brethren the course we are, by the grace of God, irrevocably determined to pursue. It is our steadfast aim to reform the church or to testify against its errors and defections, until testimony will be no longer heard. And we commit the issue into the hands of him who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen.

A list of the Ministers, signers of the above Act and Testimony.

James Magraw, James Latta, Samuel D. Blythe, J. W. Scott, Robert Steel, John Gray, Joshua L. Wilson, Jacob Coon, Robert Love, David R. Preston, William M. Engles, James C. Watson, John H. Symmes, David M'Kinney, Ebenezer H. Snowden, William J. Gibson, Benjamin F. Spilman, George W. Janvier, George Junkin, Robert J. Breckinridge, Ashbel Green, S. H. Crane, William Latta, Alexander A. Campbell, James Scott, Alexander M'Farlane, Isaac N. Candee, J. W. M'Kennan, William Wylie, Cornelius H. Mustard, William L. Breckinridge, I. V. Brown, George Marshall, Oscar Harris, William Sickels, George D. M'Cuenn, Samuel G. Winchester.

The Gift of the Holy Spirit---No. 5.

IN our last, having taken a cursory and general view of the great variety of acceptation of the word "*Spirit*" in the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, we now request the attention of our readers to one most important and prominent acceptation of this term in the New Institution. In order to this we shall carefully examine the phrase "*ministration of the Spirit.*"

Although we have the word *diakonia*, here rendered *ministration*, at least thirty-two times in the Apostles' testimony, we have it but once in connexion with the word *Spirit*. 2 Cor. iii. 9. This word is properly rendered by the word *ministration*, *ministry*, *serving*, *service*, *waiting*, *attendance*, *charge*, according to the connexion. This is universally admitted. The most common and current acceptation of the word is indicated by the term *ministry*. Paul frequently uses it in this precise import.

In the passage under consideration there can be no difficulty in ascertaining the meaning; for *the ministration of the Spirit* is contrasted with the *ministration of death;* and what is called the *ministration of the Spirit* is also called the *ministration of righteousness;* and this again is contrasted with the *ministration of condemnation.* Now the thing that was formerly *ministered* is in verse 6 called *letter;* and the thing that is now *ministered* is called *spirit.*

No passage in the Apostles' writings abounds more with strong contrasts than this 3d chapter of the 2d Epistle to the Corinthians. We have in it Old Institution and New Institution—tables of stone, tables of the heart—letter and spirit—killing and making alive—ministry of Spirit, ministry of death, ministry of justification, ministry of condemnation, ministry of Moses, ministry of the Apostles—Moses veiled, the Apostles unveiled—fading glory, abounding glory—the thing abolished, and the thing which continues.

The Apostle seems to have fallen into this mood by the petulance of some who talked about his carrying letters of recommendation to

the church in Corinth. He told them that they themselves were Christ's letters of recommendation to him, though ministered by himself and his fellow-laborers, written not with ink, but by the Spirit of the living God; not on tables of stone, but on the fleshly tables of the heart.

Our present object, however, is only to ascertain the precise import of the phrase *ministry* or *ministration of the Spirit.* The contrasts drawn by the Apostle leaves no doubt on the mind of the attentive student, that, by these words the Apostle only means the introduction of the gospel, by the ministry of the Apostles, contrasted with the introduction of the law by the service or ministry of Moses.

The contrast throughout is between *two institutions*—law and gospel—letter and spirit—a system of condemnation, a system of justification—death and life—two writings—one on stone, and one on the heart—one killing, the other making alive—one veiled in figure, and one unveiled—the one tending to bondage, the other to liberty.

The *spirit*, then, here is only another name for the gospel. This is so evident that most critics and commentators of eminence assert it. The reason is obvious—not indeed because the gospel was first preached accompanied by "the gift of the Holy Spirit"—not because the Apostles proclaimed the gospel with "the demonstration and manifestation of the Spirit;" for Moses in the ministry of the *letter* was sustained by the Spirit of God, by various demonstrations of its presence and power; but because the gospel is, in part, "the promise of the Spirit," and is designed to *minister the Holy Spirit* to all the believers. That which is begotten and born by the gospel is a new and holy spirit; or, in other words, "that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Hence by a metonymy, a very common figure of speech in the sacred writings, the gospel is sometimes called *the spirit*.

Illustrative and confirmatory of this, the reader has only to examine the context in which this phrase occurs The Old Institution or Testament is as often and as variously spoken of in this chapter as the New Institution or the gospel. It is explained as "*the law written and engraven on two tables of stone.*" It is by the same figure of speech called "*condemnation*"—"*death*"—because it *ministered* condemnation and death. It is said "to kill," while the gospel quickens or "makes alive."

Now, *whatever gives life gives spirit.* The law gave no life, no spirit, except that of bondage, because it killed—the gospel gives the spirit of liberty and life, because it makes alive. The law was not, however, naked or abstract death; neither is the gospel naked or abstract spirit. The law was death clothed in words of threatening; the gospel is spirit clothed in words of life.

This is not the only passage in which the Apostle thought and spoke in this manner of contrast. We find him using the same leading contrasts and giving the same designations to law and gospel. In Romans, seventh chapter, he contrasts the *state* under Moses and under Christ—under the *letter* and the *spirit.* In the beginning of the 8th chapter he asserts, "There is no *condemnation* to them under

Christ;" because under Christ he has before shown, "we are not under *law*, but under *favor*." But here he adds, "Because the law of the Spirit of life"—i. e. the gospel coming by Jesus Christ "has made me free from the law of sin and death"—i. e. the letter. "We now serve in newness of spirit, and not in oldness of the letter."

In the same context he speaks of living according to the flesh, and according to the spirit; of living in the flesh and in the spirit; of having both "Christ" and "the spirit of Christ" dwelling in us; of being "led by the Spirit," and "having the Spirit of God dwelling in us."

In his letter to the Galatians he speaks in the same language: "Walk by the Spirit," says he, "and you will not fulfil the lusts of the flesh." "If you be led by the Spirit, you are not under the law." "Since we live by the Spirit, let us also walk by the Spirit." And it is in this connexion, when contrasting law and gospel, the walking by the flesh and the walking by the Spirit, he speaks of

"THE FRUIT OF THE SPIRIT."

This is opposed to the works of the flesh, the offspring of that principle, which under the law works death. The phrase "fruit of the Spirit," in the connexion in which it stands, is equivalent to *the fruit of the gospel.* The gospel obeyed works out "love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, fidelity, meekness, temperance:—against such fruit there is no law." Gal. v. Again, says Paul, Eph. v. 8. "Walk as children of *light.*" [Now the fruit of this *light* (the Spirit) consists in all goodness, and righteousness, and truth.] "Be filled with the Spirit." "Let the word of Christ dwell richly in you," "singing psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs." Thus the phrases "Being filled with the Spirit," and "Having the word of Christ (gospel) dwelling richly in the heart," are explained by the same injunction to sing psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, with grateful hearts to the Lord. Compare Eph. v. 18, 19. and Col. iii. 16.

If, then, (as I presume the intelligent will perceive,) the phrase "*ministration of the Spirit*" mean the introduction of the gospel by the ministry of the Apostles; and "*the fruit of the Spirit*" mean the practical results of the gospel in the heart, or the gospel obeyed; and thus the term "*spirit*," in the style of the Apostles, occasionally means no more than the *gospel*, may it not be said that receiving the gospel into the heart, is, in the Apostle's sense, *receiving the Spirit?*

This question at least deserves a careful and devout examination. It is obvious that *Christ is received by receiving the gospel;* and if Christ be received by receiving the gospel, why not the Spirit of God also?

But where is the proof that Christ is received by receiving the gospel? "He came to his own people, and they received him not—*believed not in him;* but to as many as received him to them he gave power to become the sons of God," &c. To receive a person, is to receive him crediting and cordially recognizing him in his own proper character. "As you have received Christ Jesus the Lord," walk by his directions. Thus they who credit his word, receive him; and are

therefore said to "have Christ in them." "If Christ be in you," says Paul to the Romans, "the body is dead as respects sin." "*That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith.*" "*Christ liveth in me.*"

There was, then, a receiving of Christ, familiarly spoken of in the age of the Apostles; and there was a receiving of the grace of God, and a receiving of the Spirit also, in receiving the gospel. There was a dwelling and living of Christ in the heart; nay, there was an inhabitation of God himself in the hearts of the believers. For "if a man love me," says the Messiah, "he will keep my word, and my Father will love him, and we will come and *make our abode with him.*" "Behold," says Jesus, "I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will enter and sup with him and he with me." "Our fellowship is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ our Lord."

But besides this indirect and figurative reception of the Spirit of God, the Holy Spirit, by the gospel; these gracious influences, suggestions, illuminations, consolations, and invigorating impulses of the good Spirit of God, by and through the gospel in the heart, making the heart a cistern, a fountain whence living waters constantly flow; is there not a *substantive*, a real and unfigurative reception of the Holy Spirit himself, in the sense of the question Paul asked the Galatians, (iii. 2.) "*Did you receive the Spirit* by works of law, or by obedience of faith?"

Such a reception of the Spirit there certainly was; and of this "gift of the Holy Spirit," this "demonstration of the Spirit," this "manifestation of the Spirit," these "spiritual gifts," we have already spoken as conferred upon the *first fruits* in the *last days* of the Jewish age—in the setting up of the kingdom of the Messiah; but of such a reception of the Spirit since the LAST DAYS of the Jewish age, since the creation of *one new man* of believing Jews and Gentiles, and the breathing into him the holy spirit of this new life, there has been no *substantive*, abstract and literal communication of the Holy Spirit to any man. Such is the experience of all the catholic congregation of Christ. There has arisen no prophet, no originator of new ideas, no worker of miracles, no controller of nature's laws, no person having any manifestation of the Spirit, or showing any divine power among men.

Now these manifestations of the Spirit were for the benefit of the community; but the Holy Spirit as now promised and received through the gospel, is for the benefit of the subject himself. There are, however, other phrases and terms found in the Christian Scriptures which require our attention, and when correctly appreciated farther illustrate and confirm the preceding.

Although with respect to various misconceptions of what is written on this subject, we have enlarged our remarks beyond the limits of literary investigation, still we aimed at no more in this essay than a fair and full examination of the phrases "*ministration of the Spirit,*" one acceptation of the word "*Spirit,*" the *fruit of the Spirit,*" and "*receiving of the Spirit*" If we have ascertained these, it is all the merit we claim for the present essay.

Concerning the Christian Institution, as now before us, in the examination of these leading terms and phrases, we may say the Old Institution had no glory in comparison with the glory that excells. The gospel, when understood and cordially embraced, greatly enlarges our conceptions of God in all his glorious perfections; brings us into the nearest and holiest relation to him; inspires with the loftiest and most sublime motives; causes Christ to live in us; brings the Holy Spirit into our hearts, and elevates us to communion with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ our Lord; and this gives us an earnest of the future and heavenly inheritance, uncorruptible, undefiled, and unfading. May the Lord preserve us to his everlasting kingdom! To whom be all honor and majesty, now and forever. Amen!

EDITOR.

Mysteries of Orthodoxy.

GOD has divided this visible creation into various distinct departments, and has adapted the laws of each to its productions. And so he has divided his revelations into dispensations, and adapted them to the inhabitants of each. They may be divided into seven dispensations: The first was delivered to Adam; the second to Noah, the third to Abraham; the fourth to Moses; the fifth to John the Baptist; the sixth to Jesus Christ; the seventh to the Apostles.

When men become wise in their own imaginations, they begin to pervert the arrangement and order of God. They first display their ignorence by trying to grow plants suited to one climate, in another, (attempt to grow sugar cane in the wheat climate;) next they change the use of things—feed the ox on flesh, and the lion on hay, &c.

These absurdities can be easily seen, but men do not notice how absurdly they act in regard to God's revelation. They take from the different dispensations and try to plant in this. Thus they place all Christians, Jews, or Gentiles, under the law of Moses. Next they change the use of things, by applying the Epistles, specially written and adapted to churches, to the unbelieving, the fearful, disobedient, and abominable. This is like feeding the ox on flesh, or the lion on hay. Next they change the Gospel, and substitute what they call "Holy Ghost Religion," and put every thing out of place. They set the Holy Ghost to convincing the world of sin, without proof or argument; and next they set the Holy Ghost to pardoning sins; they set him to teaching without words, and make him give *faith* without testimony, and consolation without promises. Some set the Holy Ghost to baptizing; others say they are baptized in, or with, the Holy Ghost. They say *water* means Holy Ghost, and *fire* means Holy Ghost; and, to cap the climax, they pray for, and to, the Holy Ghost, and at the same time profess to have it in them. They ask the Holy Ghost to come, then ask God to send it; then say it has come; then ask to be baptized in the Holy Ghost and fire; then say they have before been baptized in the Holy Ghost and fire. No wonder they speak of

religion as a great mystery! I fear thousands who make loud profession will die without the knowledge of God—will never understand the plain matter of fact religion taught by Jesus Christ and his Apostles.

M. WINANS.

What is Remission?

Dear brother Campbell,

IS there no way that people can be made to understand what is meant by the terms *pardon, remission, forgiveness of sins?* How many answers would be given to the simple question, *What is forgiveness of sins?* One would say, 'It is good feelings;' another would say, 'It is love in the soul;' another, 'It is love to God and man;' another, 'It is peace with God and man;' and another, 'It is joy and gratitude,' &c. Now these all may be, and are, effects of the forgiveness of sins; but forgiveness itself must be a proclamation from that Power that is superior to the law transgressed; and that proclamation must be special or general—it must embrace all transgressors of a certain class, or it must have special application to some, without condition. But if it be conditional, and general, then all who comply with the condition set forth in the proclamation are the subjects of it; and such as do not comply with the condition set forth in the proclamation are not pardoned. Jesus Christ is that *Power* who is superior to the law. He has made proclamation that all who believe the gospel sent to the world by his Apostles, and obey it by submitting to baptism in his name, shall have remission of past sins. And if they ignorantly or inadvertently transgress afterwards, he has proclaimed pardon on condition of confession and prayer. These things being as before stated, the knowledge of forgiveness depends upon the performance of the condition set forth in the proclamation, or upon our knowledge of a full compliance with the condition. Then our spirits testify, by words and actions, that we have complied with the conditions of the proclamation made by the Spirit of God. In this way the two spirits testify and confirm each other's testimony, that we are God's children—that we have been begotten and born of the institution appointed of God. Without this testimony, all the *good feelings*, and all the *think so's* and *hope so's* that can be enumerated will not prove the fact.

M. WINANS.

Thomas Cleland, D. D.

The Graces of the Spirit, and the Beauties of the Christian Rhetoric of Thomas Cleland, D. D. *as exhibited in some Strictures on a piece signed* "A Presbyterian," *which appeared in this work under date of April,* 1834, *p.* 164:—

THE quotations and original beauties of this rhetorician show in what school he has been educated. Strewed over two columns in the

Western Luminary, July 2, the following specimens of the graces of his spirit and style are found:—

"The foulest whelp of sin;" "None seemed maturer for the flames of hell;" "Seven caverns in hell, the deepest and most wretched, inhabited by hypocrites;" "Wretches under the influence of the devil;" "Cloak his villainy;" "His diabolical purpose;" "Ridiculous, lying, heart-loving, soul fattening gallimaufry;" "Some of the fraternity, like unclean birds over a carrion, sniggering and chuckling, and voraciously devouring the delicious morsel;" "Bitter in the belly;" "The imagination that whelped it;" "The foul offspring of some mean, cowardly, base, hypocritical slanderer;" "His dark, assassin-like purpose;" "Foul fancy of the malicious inventor;" "A loyal subject of the kingdom of darkness;" "Campbell's doltish vizard;" "His fiendish covert;" "Revelling in the gall of his own heart."

This "*aged Pastor*," as he calls himself, is an excellent example to the *young* of his flocks. The graces of his spirit will certainly beautify the youth of the two congregations of Harrodsburg and Providence. These delicious odors of this aged rose of Presbyterianism will perfume all the vales of Mercer county, and so delight the young "communicants" as to excite in them a spirit of emulating this pattern of Christian meekness and a holy conversation.

We courteously replied to his interrogatories the very day we received a letter from our correspondent, and, as far as our correspondent authorized us, gave him the information he solicited. But instead of disproving the statements and imputations of the article alluded to, he breaks out in the foregoing strains; and, insensible of the shame he has heaped upon himself, requests his Presbyterian brethren to republish it over the West. Is it not time that the *morals*, as well as the *doctrine* of this sect, should be revised. I hope that the projected reformation, now in progress in the Presbyterian church, may extend to the morality of the preachers, as well as to the standards of doctrine.

EDITOR.

Christendom in its Dotage.

A HINT TO REFORMERS.

THIS is certainly "the last time." "In the latter days perilous times will come; for men will be self-lovers, money-lovers, boasters, proud, defamers, disobedient to parents, ungrateful, unholy, without natural affection, bargain-breakers, slanderers, incontinent, fierce, haters of good men, headstrong, puffed up, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having the form of godliness, but denying the power of it." Thus testifies Paul according to the wisdom given to him. Who, that is intimately acquainted with the signs of this time, needs to be informed that this is true to the life, of many—perhaps, the majority of those who profess the Christian name.

Are there not as much selfishness and love of money—as much pride, defamation, ingratitude, injustice, breach of contract, slander—

(to say nothing of the more vulgar and sensual lusts and passions,) amongst those who have *a form of godliness*, as amongst those who have no forms of religion? Was there ever an age or population more selfish and more devoted to gain and to the valuation of talents and virtue on the principle of subserviency to wealth, than the present generation? Every thing is in the market, and every thing is to be valued as it gives the possessor power to accumulate property. The tongue of the orator, the science of the learned, the ingenuity of the artist, the patriotism of the citizen, the courage of the soldier, the virtue of the moralist, and the zeal of the partizan, are all appreciated according to their subserviency to the aggrandizement of the possessor. Even female beauty and elegance of manners are valued as the passport to fortune, and those endowments of mind and person, which have no direct influence in the accumulation of wealth, are the only articles in market for which there are no bidders.

The friendships of this world are formed and cherished on this principle. The rich have many friends, but the poor is hated of his neighbor. So long as the merchant, mechanic, or manufacturer expects to find a customer in his neighbor, he cordially salutes him in the street, and extends to him the right hand of fellowship; but should he cease to be regarded in the relation of a buyer or a profitable consumer of his wares, and be related to him only as he is related to all mankind, the obsequious bow degenerates into a nod, and the fellowship of the hand sinks into a cold and formal motion.

In the assemblies for public worship as much respect is paid to wealth and place as to piety and virtue—nay, more. The poor man, though of unquestioned piety, sits far back from the *sacred desk*, while the rich and honorable on earth, on the abstract virtue of gold, sit nearest the altar. Now if the church is ever, from resemblance to the celestial state, called "*the kingdom of heaven*;" and if it affords us any idea of the distinctions in that state, one might expect to see the golden favorites of Mammon—the Midases, the Crœsuses, the Girards, and the Rothchilds sitting nearest the throne; while the poor and the humble born would scarcely be within sight of him who is the fountain of honor and glory. We presume the reader will concur with us in the opinion, that if any of the above named gentlemen had embraced Christianity in the 19th century, as it is professed and practised in the popular churches of this day, that they would have had the nighest access to the "Ambassadors of Heaven," and would have sat in state nearest the wooden throne, from which the orator of the church addresses both Heaven and Earth.

But why dwell on this as if it were the only sign of the fatal delinquency which has seized Christendom! Where is the love for good men? Where is the respect due to the characters which God most approves? Where is the power of godliness seen triumphing over all that is fleshly, and sensual, and devilish? A few green spots here and there in the wastes of Zion—a few individuals exhibiting these fruits of the ancient faith, need not be adduced in proof that the whole body is not full of wounds, and bruises, and putrifying sores. The leprosy

of the Apostacy has spread over all Christendom, Catholic and Protestant.

The morals of christendom are the best evidence of the influence of corrupted Christianity. "By their fruits you shall know them." Is the tone of popular piety and morality correspondent with the justice, and mercy, and piety inculcated by the author of the Christian faith? No one dare say it is. The perilous age has assuredly come. The form without the power is every where apparent. The spirit of the world has invaded the church. The love of the world triumphs over the love of God. The fashion of the world has supplanted the manners and customs of Christians. Christianity is made to wear the livery of Paganism, to suit the taste of the admirers of Pagan philosophy and morality. The rage for partyism is such, that the whole order of Christian worship is fashioned to the caprice of the rich and influential, whom it would allure into the ranks of its profession by a compromise of all its heavenly attributes for the fascinations of rank and fortune. Ministers of religion, as they are called, are busied in devices for catching the men of rank and fortune, by converting Christianity to their taste, rather than converting them to Christianity. The sects have all approximated to the world more than the world has approximated to Christ. Every thing to suit the whim of carnality. If one or two persons of influence happen to meet with a church on the Lord's day, more homage is paid to them than to the institutions of Jesus Christ. In many instances the order of the day and the attention of the audience are alike engrossed in catering to their pride or vanity.

'Cut your sermon down to thirty minutes, rather than tire or jade *a respectable gentlemen*,' says an exhorter in the Religious Herald of the 18th ultimo; 'give the country folks one hour at most, but the town's folk never more thanforty-five minutes.'* This is but a drop out of a bucket.

We have said now is the dotage of christendom. Had it not been for the *politico-theologico* missionary and various other contrivances, called "benevolent schemes," which all tend to make the institutions of Jesus Christ of non-effect, they would have gone to sleep ere now, and a fatal paralysis would have fallen upon them; for till they got up these inventions they could find nothing in the gospel according to

* No society in christendom, as far as known to us, has so rapidly degenerated into all the vices of the sects as the Regular Baptists. During the last ten or fifteon years they have almost wholly conformed to the most secular and ambitious of the sects. Ten years with them has done the business of a hundred with some others. The following trifle shows how the spirit of the world burns in them:—

"A camp-meeting will be held at Piney Grove, Mecklenburg county, near the residence of Elder J. B. Smith, 3 miles south of Bethel meeting house, 10 miles north of Clarksville, 14 miles west of Boydton, 9 miles south-west of Christiansville, and 4 miles south-east of Capt. Jeffries' store. To commence on the 13th day of August. Persons wishing to build tents, will be furnished at the place with suitable materials, and good pasture will be furnished for the accommodation of the horses of those who may attend. Ministering brethren are affectionately requested to attend."

their creed to afford them either employment or enjoyment. But the old systems are withering and fast dying, notwithstanding all the stimulants and tonics of temperance and proselytism.

The Pope himself is in agony to save the mitre. The politic Catholics fear that the present may be the last Vicar of Christ. Their last enterprize will be to plant their standard in America in anticipation of an earthquake in Europe. A Cardinal's cap has been sent to the Bishop of Charleston, the first American Bishop who ever attained to this dignity. In France the Pope's pretensions, even amongst Catholics, are debateable. In England the tithe system languishes. The King in his insanity forgets not the adage, "*No Bishop, no King*," and promises to cover them with his shield—*and, as in duty bound, they will ever pray.* The Presbyterian Church in Scotland has been much agitated with Pelagian, Arminian, and Unitarian heresies. It has split in Ireland on the same rock. In America it is virtually rent in twain from top to bottom. The good old *Solemn League and Covenant* part of it, called the "*Covenanters*," small as the sect is, are now split into two parties on the question of *magistracy*. The Methodists are filing off under various leaders and banners. The *peaceful* Quakers have *fallen out by the way*, and still *push* one another to the wall. All sects are tottering under the weight of years and the imbecilities of human devices. Meanwhile, fanatics, knaves, and hypocrites are dealing out new revelations with unparallelled impudence and unblushing effrontery. Male and female false teachers are hazardous of new frauds and fictions, and the meanest of the mean among them readily find, in the ignorance and credulity of the age, a people prepared for their delusions. The success of one impostor emboldens and encourages another. Every few years gives us an Anna Lee, a Jemima Wilkinson, a Joanna Southcoat, a Joe Smith, a religious Robinson Crusoe. Here we have the Mormonites—there, the Irvingites—and somewhere else, the Hixites. "Lo, here!" and "Lo, there!" are as popular as ever; and the Here-*ites* and the There-*ites* are creeping into every sect in christendom.

In the meanwhile, every species of infidelity, from Pyrrhus down to Fanny Wright— from the pure idealist to the gross materialist—is taught with the zeal of the crusaders and the perseverance of Saint Xavier, under the pretence of superior wisdom and a more elevated philosophy. Stripplings in their teens, with Thomas Paine in their pocket, and a cigar in their cheek, who have read the Life of Franklin, and the Declaration of Independence by Thomas Jefferson; together with Ovid's Metamorphoses, and the Seven Wonders of the World, pity the weakness of Newton and Bacon, and Locke and Boyle, and ten thousand others, *and only wish, as duteous sons, their fathers had been more wise!*

And while all things are thus retrograde in their progress, there is not one voice heard in all the world outside of the boundaries of the present reformation, calling upon the people to return to the *original gospel and order of things*. 'Reform' is, indeed, a word of good repute in both church and state; and all, except the Old Presbyterians,

Regular Baptists, and Roman Catholics, admit there is need of it; but while the word *reform* is popular every where except in the courts of kings and the conclaves of the superior clergy, the portions of it which are popular are of the homœopathetic school, very small and diluted; so that, like friendship, it is but a name—"a charm that lulls to sleep."

Should we not, then, brethren of the restoration, arise and shine in the light of Heaven and in the beauty of holiness; and while we contend for New Testament Christianity, adorn our lives with New Testament piety and morality?

"To do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with our God," comprehend more than most of us imagine. Would you say that man walked *humbly* who will not keep and obey the least commandment of the great King? Would you say that he does *justly* who renders not to all their dues—who violates his engagements, forfeits his word, or breaks a bargain with any man? Would you say that he *loves mercy* who feels not for the poor and the afflicted—who exacts the last farthing from the needy and the destitute, and who rarely feeds the hungry or clothes the naked? You would not. Then, my brethren, see that you sincerely and fully fill up the measure of your own apprehension of the true intent and meaning of these excellent words; and that you suffer not the good cause which you have espoused, and do so nobly profess, to languish, or to be impeded in its progress by any failure on your part to sustain the good confession which you have made before many witnesses.

The day of the Lord is near; and, as a thief in the night, will come upon all those who are not habitually looking for his appearing and his kingdom. But, brethren, you are not in darkness, that that day should come upon you unawares. EDITOR.

Campbellism Unmasked.

ANY one who wishes to get a sight of this singular non-descript, in all its naked deformity, will please attend at the Mechanic's Institute, Cincinnati, on any Wednesday evening, at 7 o'clock; where the Rev. Doctor *Sleigh*, from "famous London town," as he tells every body, gives a most appalling exhibition of this terrific creature. ☞As the monster is kept in an iron cage by the Rev. Dr. Sleigh, a celebrated keeper, just from London, American ladies and gentlemen, how timid soever, may, with perfect safety to their persons, attend free of danger and of cost.

Ludicrous as the above may appear to all sober-minded persons, it is in the most perfect keeping with the mountebank sayings and doings of this London Theologue. A handbill, either from himself or some of his dramatic prompters, in the most massy and *opaque* capitals, was lately forwarded to us, in the words following, *to wit*:—

"CAMPBELLISM UNMASKED, BY DR. SLEIGH, THIS EVENING, IN THE MECHANICS' INSTITUTE, AT 7 O'CLOCK."

From various sources we learn that this gentleman Doctor appears in all places with "*London*" inscribed upon his escutcheons, as if his having come from *London* should sanctify and sanction not only his body, soul, and spirit, but even his doctrine too. Now of whatever use (among the *fashionables*) it may be to a tailor, milliner, or hair-dresser, to put upon his or her sign, "*Lately from London*," we know of no advantage it can be amongst those who have souls as well as bodies, to be informed in handbills, newspapers, and pulpits, that a preacher has come from *London;* especially as it is well known in all the world that *London has produced as many great dunces and sinners as any city in Europe of its antiquity and population.*

But it will be of more interest to our readers to know how this *Londoner* has unmasked Campbellism at the Mechanics' Institute in Cincinnati. If all our readers had been acquainted with the literary and theological labors of a Mr. Smallwood or Underwood, (for in truth I have forgotten his name; but I know he was of some sort of *wood*—from *London* or *Windsor*, a chair maker, I think, by profession; but a Doctor of Particularism, and of great fame at Enon in Cincinnati:) I say, if our readers knew how he unmasked Campbellism, and how the Sheriff of Cincinnati *unmasked him*, they could be easily inducted into the mountebank doings at the Mechanics' Institute. But as we have not time for such details, we shall inform the curious that this Dr. Sleigh is the same gentleman from *London* who debated with John T. Johnson, Esq. of Georgetown, Ky., a few weeks since, on the question, '*Is remission of sin by Jesus Christ conditional or unconditional?*' —the *Doctor* contending that Jesus Christ forgives sin *unconditionally*, without faith, repentance, baptism, a change of heart or life, or any thing wrought in, or done by, any creature. This is his complete unmasking of Campbellism, as he most opprobriously calls the gospel of Jesus Christ as proclaimed by the Twelve Apostles. If I did not know the difficulties and shifts of the Baptists in the West, I would have been astonished to find the Regulars in troops consenting to have their own heads severed from their shoulders for the sake of having our brethren the disciples of Christ aspersed: for few of the American Baptists concur in theory with Dr. Sleigh of *London*—few, indeed, of the hypercalvinists, any where, will say that there is no more connexion between faith, repentance, and baptism, and remission, than between deism, atheism, and libertinism, and remission: for if remission, like calvinian election, be unconditional, the atheist is as sure of pardon as the believing penitent. EDITOR.

Unconditional Pardon.

THAT any person from *London*, or from *Rome*, a Doctor of Grammar, a Doctor of Logic, or a Doctor of Medicine, (to say nothing of Theology,) in the year 1834, should affirm that remission of sins is *unconditional*, is worthy of record in the chronicles of reformation. For my part, I am no admirer of the word *conditional*, nor *uncondi-*

tional, in the affairs of salvation, as they have been bandied about amongst the ecclesiastics for sixteen centuries. But they are *English* words, and should be understood by English men. I have, then, only to remark that when an Englishman says that remission of sins is *unconditional*, without any qualifying epithet, he makes himself superlatively ridiculous; for he excludes the mediation of Jesus Christ, the work of the Holy Spirit, the Bible, the ministry of the word, faith, repentance, obedience of faith, and every thought, word, or work of any created thing; and exhibits God in the most dishonorable character as instituting so many means—issuing promises, precepts, ordinances, threatenings for four thousand years—sending his Son, the Holy Spirit, the Apostles, commanding men to believe, repent, and be baptized; for *unless* they did so, they should perish, &c.—all of which is in positive, literal, and direct repugnance to forgiving sins *unconditionally*.

I am in doubt whether in any age or country any Englishman ever did so outrage language, reason, common sense, the Bible, all christendom, so much as Dr. Sleigh. His position stultifies and nullifies the whole remedial system. He has, without intending it, done myself and brethren the greatest honor: for in thus unmasking the disciples of Christ, he has unmasked the Bible, Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Twelve Apostles—and made atheism and deism, and murder, and robbery, and fraud as safe and secure a path to pardon, as the Bible, faith, repentance, and baptism. EDITOR.

Progress of Reform.

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

SYRACUSE, *New York*, July 5, 1834.

I SIT down to-day to continue the notice of reformation in this state. In Marion, Wayne county, 20 have been immersed. This is among the Christian denomination; but the cause of the reformation has been checked and injured in this place from a source that I will particularly notice in my next. On the whole, the cause is gaining ground rapidly among the Christians. Last week I saw brother R. lately from Canada, formerly of this state. He intends to spend the summer here, and visit his brethren, the general meetings, and conference, and is boldly pleading with them for reformation. He says he thinks it is not best to leave a house because it is dirty, but if possible to cleanse it. I have visited several others who understand the ancient gospel; but some probably through fear, others through policy, remain where they are. In either case the leaven is at work, and will ere long leaven the whole mass, not only in this state, but in Canada.

At Gates, Monroe county, the unfortunate circumstance of which you are already informed, has put a damp upon the cause through that whole region; but the wound is gradually healing: six have been immersed. Seven members of this church have united with seven persons from the Baptists and Christians in Greece, and constituted a church, and seven have since been added to their number by immersion. There is one circumstance worthy of note here; last winter a man entered a protracted meeting of the Baptists in Rochester, left his hat at the entrance, walked through the house to the stand, and read the 31st chapter of Isaiah to a full house, and with tears in his eyes exhorted the people to leave the commandments of men and cleave to the word of God; and then immediately left the house, saying that he was a disciple of the Lord Jesus. The congregation was thrown into consternation, and the stranger was pronounced a C——ite. Soon after he was met and recognized by the Pastor, and accused of C——ism, of which he was an utter stranger. After being satisfied of this, he invited him to fill his desk. He was invited among the Presbyterians, and then among the Methodists. Soon after, in private conversation, a gentleman observed to him that he talked like one H——. He replied, if there was a man on earth like himself, he wished to see him. He immediately called on brother H——, and soon after visited the brethren at Gates. He had seen the disease of the Christian world, but had not yet clearly perceived the remedy. He heard and embraced the truth. He is a man of education and talent, and promises to make an efficient proclaimer. He was a licenced preacher among the Congregationalists, and had just moved from the East.

In Sweden, near Brockport, Monroe county, four have been immersed. This was what is generally called *a gospel hardened place*. The people were mostly Deists and Universalists. Two of those immersed had been Deists. A number of that class have said that they now believe, and will probably vow allegiance to King Immanuel.

Bussy, Orleans county. A brother and his wife moved to this place last winter. Brother T—, brother Y—, and myself visited them a few times. Seven were immersed, and several of the Christians united with them, and they now meet every first day and break bread.

In Elba, Genessee county, seven have been immersed. In this place we have had proof that those who listen with attention for any length of time to the gospel in its purity, must obey it, or flee to scepticism for a refuge. Seven more have been immersed in different places in this county.

A most disgraceful scene was transacted by the Presbyterians of Pembroke, in this county. I had an appointment of two weeks standing there. Two weeks previous to this they changed their singing school from Wednesday evening to Friday evening, on purpose, as many suppose, to prevent my speaking there. At 5 o'clock the singers came together, with three Presbyterian clergymen and a large number of laymen, avowedly for the purpose of hearing the singing, but evidently in concert for another purpose; and at candle-lighting a large concourse of people assembled to hear a discourse. I entered the house and informed the singing-master of my appointment, and requested him to withdraw to the meeting-house, which was only across the way; or, if they chose, I would occupy the meeting house. The Pastor replied, 'The singers had possession of the house, and therefore had a right to it.' Another clergymen said, "I would have you know that we dont allow a man of your sentiments to preach in our house." A sceptic replied, "You are like the dog in the manger—you neither eat yourselves, nor let others eat." A scene of confusion immediately ensued. They would neither occupy the meeting-house, nor suffer me to occupy it; and some of the inhabitants seemed determined that if I could not preach they should not sing. The three clergymen stad till near 9 o'clock; and such was the warmth on both sides, that I was fearful they would come to blows. But enough of this—I will pass to better things.

In Clarence and Lancaster, Erie county, the work has exceeded every thing in this state. Ninety-five were immersed within two months—31 of them at one meeting of three days; and on Sunday we had an audience of from twelve to fifteen hundred. Thirty-six have left the streets of Babylon, making in all 131, and the prospect of many more being soon gathered to the Lord. One of the number immersed was a preacher among the United Brethren, a man beloved by all who know him, and will do much in the good cause. He immersed 5 of the above number. This brings me to the date of June 1st. In addition to this I will add about 100 immersed in Canada since September last. I have visited the province three times, and 34 were immersed during my visits.

J. J. MOSS.

PARIS, *Tennessee*, June 17, 1834.

WE had a big meeting here on Saturday and Lord's day, 7th and 8th inst. Brethren Mansel W. Matthews, Allen Kendrick, Samuel Giles, Lyon D'Spain, and myself were present as proclaimers. Immediately preceding, during, and succeeding the meeting, nine made the good confession, and were immersed—among them three Methodists. One of these was an old lady, and had been in their society 23 years. She had been reading and *thinking for herself*, and had resolved to "obey GOD rather than *man*." The scene when this old mother was immersed was extremely affecting. It was late at night. The blue skies were clear and unclouded above; and studded and sparkling with planets, and suns and their systems, where He who is "from everlasting to everlasting" reigns in infinite dominion, and presides in his infinite power and wisdom over the works of his hands. Not a breath of air broke in upon the solemn stillness of the scene, and no sound fell upon the ear, save the soft murmurs of the rippling stream. A large congregation lined the banks. After singing, prayer, and an earnest and forcible exhortation from brother Kendrick, she was conducted down into the water and immersed. As she came out, her daughter, one of our most pious and zealous sisters, walked into the stream, fell upon her neck, weeping tears of joy and O what a scene ensued! It drew tears from all our eyes. May grace, mercy, and peace from God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the communion of the Holy Spirit be with you!

JOHN R. HOWARD.

FAYETTE, *Missouri*, June 18, 1834.

I HAVE been promising for some time to give you some account of the progress of reform in this part of the state, particularly in this county. In addition to the church established in the town of Fayette by brother Henry Thomas in the winter of 1822-3, the Baptist church at Mount Moriah, 3½ miles from Fayette, of which I was a member in April, 1833, had become so much confused and excited by their Pastor (the celebrated Ebenezer Rodgers) and some of his friends, that seven of us withdrew from said church, with the privilege of meeting in the meeting house a portion of the time to worship as a church. We continue to do so; and the church shortly after chose me for an Elder or Bishop.

I commenced proclaiming the word of the Lord to the people as well as I could. We had now in this county two small churches of Reforming Baptists, discarding all human creeds, platforms, formularies, disciplines, &c. and taking God's holy word as the man of our counsel, &c. In this county there were at that time four churches of what was then called the Christian body. We found them very friendly, preaching the true gospel, (for they preached the word,) and publicly renouncing all systems and *isms*, and adhering to the Bible alone. These people evinced great anxiety for a union with us, to which we readily consented, having mingled with and preached with each other at different times and places, but especially at a four days' meeting held in this county, where the principle portion of the brethren were present: and there being two churches in the town of Fayette, it was agreed to have a meeting in town to try to effect the union of the two into one church; and the brethren from all the churches in the county were requested to attend. In the interim between the two meetings, (that is, on the third Saturday and Lord's day in August, 1833,) another small Baptist church that had divided in this county, was organized on the same principles of the church with me. There were nine of them; they participated in the union. The two churches in Fayette met agreeably to appointment, and a number of brethren

from the different reforming churches in the county; when one of the most pleasant scenes that falls to the lot of Christians in this unfriendly world, was witnessed—that is, the two churches unanimously agreed to be one church. Thus we met each other on the word of God, where we are desirous to meet all the true lovers of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

The church at Mount Moriah, of which I am a member, commenced about a year past, with 7 members—it now has forty. The other that commenced in August with 9, now has about 30. There has been additions to all the reformed churches in the county during the same period; and to the church in Fayette, an addition of from 60 to 70 members; and although there has been, and still is, the most formidable opposition, yet we have increased perhaps more for the number of laborers than any one of the sects in the same bounds—and prospects still better.

The Macedonian cry is heard from so many places, that it is impossible for us to supply them. There might be a number of churches formed immediately, if there were laborers or proclaimers of the gospel to attend to them. There is, perhaps, as great need for able proclaimers of the gospel in this state at this time, as any part of the United States. Will not some of our brethren from Kentucky or Ohio pay us a visit this summer or fall?

JOEL PREWIT.

RICHMOND, *Kentucky*, June 9, 1834.

I REGRET that I have no good news to communicate in reference to the advancement of truth and piety among the congregations of this county. Not one of them worships God according to the word of truth. Some of them meet twelve times a year to hear twelve *sermons* from some called preachers, and break the loaf twice in the time; and thus they grow in grace and in the knowledge of the truth. Others meet twenty-four times, and break the loaf twice. One single congregation meet thirty-six times a year, and commemorate the death and sufferings of Christ twelve times. This is the greatest advancement in the county, and we have no good omen that we shall be able to advance much farther; for be it known unto you that many of our reformists think this advance much too far, and would be better content to have two communion *seasons*, and to meet twelve times a year, and be called Reformers, than to meet on the first day of the week to keep the ordinances as delivered by Christ and his Apostles. These are naked truths in reference to the so called reformed churches in the county of Madison; and I am not sure, brother Campbell, that the picture would not suit many other counties from my knowledge of them. I would now ask you how far we have advanced in the proposed reformation? O. C. STEELE.

[I fear the brethren who travel so slowly will die in the wilderness. They would require an antediluvian age to fit them for the kingdom of heaven. It will not do, brethren. Jesus says, "I would you were cold or hot," and thus still speaks the Holy Spirit to the churches. No congregation has reformed according to the New Testament (our creed) which does not meet every week to keep the ordinances as delivered to us by the Apostles.]—*Ed. M. H.*

PETETE JOHN RIVER, Crawford county, *Ark. Ter.* June 11, 1834.

KNOWING that the friends of Jesus are always glad to hear of the advancement of his kingdom on earth, we send you the following communication for their encouragement and comfort. I emigrated from Indiana as a Christian minister, and brought a few of my Christian brethren with me; and here I found just settling a newly reformed Baptist preacher, by the name of Benjamin Clark. On our first acquaintance, finding that we agreed on the principles of Christian union on the word, without human explanation, and that the most of professors of religion in this country were Baptists, and all sectarian, we reasonably expected that there would be many opinions and speculations on which we could not all agree. We therefore concluded that it was peculiarly necessary, under these circumstances, for the peace and harmony of our worshipping assemblies, that we enter into the following agreement:—

First—Not to investigate any thing merely speculative in public; but preach the word as it would stand on a fair translation, as needing no explanation.

Second—That we use no words or phrases in which all Christians could not heartily agree; but as much as possible to use New Testament language in singing, praying, preaching, and all our administrations.

The brethren have united in this agreement, and walked by the same rule, and the effect has been glorious. In a few weeks the whole congregation

spoke in all parts of worship as though they had all been raised in one school. By this experiment we are still more confirmed in the belief that it would be practicable for all christendom, by carrying these principles into full practice, to restore the one language of the New Testament to the church of God on earth; and the consequence would be, that peace, harmony, and union would be restored to Zion, and the glorious gospel would go forth in its captivating simplicity and beauty, and the world would fall in love with it and be converted.

But the glorious effects of this course of preaching have not ceased here; for although we have only had opportunity for a two days' meeting once-a-month in any place but our own neighborhood, we have attended two other congregations regularly since the first of March and April. They have all thrown away their human creeds to the moles and bats, and constituted on the New Testament and Christian name, to the exclusion of all speculations and party names. In these congregations the victory over sectarianism has been universal and total. As far as we can learn, there is left amongst saints or sinners none to advocate the fallen cause. And if possible a still more glorious effect remains yet to be told—that is, that when the gospel is preached in simplicity and stripped of human appendages, and its requirements understood, we find mankind less disposed to reject it than we supposed them to be. In these three congregations we have immersed 63 in less than two months; 45 of them in ten days, 25 at a three days' meeting that ended last Monday morning, most of whom were immersed for the remission of sins. Some were Paidobaptists, and some had professed a hope before they were made to understand the requirements of the gospel.

The work will appear more wonderful when we state, that although the excitement is so great, the congregation at our two days' meeting never has exceeded 100; and on Sunday, at our three days' they were estimated at 200. The good work is still spreading. We visited some Christians on Little Piney, Johnson county, and constituted a church on the same principles, and had a two days' meeting in a Baptist church in another place, and they appointed the next Lord's day to lay aside their creed and take the New Testament and Christian name.

In our inquiries into the situation of this country, we find the people in many places are gorged with sectarianism and mysticism; and if the gospel were preached in simplicity there would be a general or very great reformation. We therefore solicit the attention of able reform proclaimers, and earnestly request them to visit Arkansas.

We address the following note to brother B. F. Hall, through your paper, because we do not know where to find him:—

Brother Hall—Your preaching at Little Rock has had great success; but although many in the territory have fell in love with the general principles, they do not fully understand how to carry them out into practice, nor fully understand the principles of the gospel. We therefore urge, as our opinion, that you ought to visit the territory, and strengthen the Reformers where they are deficient.

THOMAS WOOD.
BENJAMIN CLARK.

ORANGE SPRINGS, *Va.* June 3, 1834.

THERE is in this portion and in another portion of Virginia, a renovation of an old charge, viz.—that somewhere in the West the Reformers are holding meetings, and, by consequence, fellowship with men who are known to the community as Unitarians. This charge is now, according to information, exerting a considerable influence against the Reformation. It is *particularly* desired that you will fully place this matter before the public. The cause of truth, beloved brother, seems to require such an expose of this matter as will give it rest. May the Lord enable his people wisely to use the whole Christian armor, for there is much need!

ALBERT ANDERSON.

Dear brother Anderson,

IT would give me pleasure to gratify all the brethren in retuting, in the most ample manner, all the calumnies and slanders, which, in this liberal age of detraction, are so gratuitously heaped upon the disciples of Christ. But we should never get to the end of it: for the same calumny, new-vamped, or new-modified, springs up again and again. In reference to this slander I have only room to say, that the brethren of the reformation *formerly* were Deists, Romanists, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists, Quakers, Unitarians, Baptists, Universalists, &c. &c. But they have turned from all these vanities to serve the living God according to the New Institution of Jesus Christ our Lord. We fellowship no man as a Trinitarian, Unitarian, Universalist, Baptist, or Quaker, but as the disciples of Jesus Christ, the only begotten of the Father—in whose kingdom and patience I have the honor to be your fellow-laborer.

EDITOR.

BRIGHTON, *Upper Canada*, June 24, 1834.

I TAKE the liberty to inform you of the progress of reform in this place. The cause is on the march, notwithstanding opposition. On the 27th of May Elder G—— immersed 19—this day, 3—making in all 157 since one year last May, besides what others have immersed. We expect a number more soon.

WILLIAM H. SANFORD.

MONTICELLO, *Kentucky*, June 29, 1834.

WE have recently had what the sects call *a revival.* Twenty-five or upwards have renounced the sects and the world, and submitted to the government of King Jesus. If I thought I could be heard, I would ask you what is to be done with such as refuse time after time to partake of the ordinances of the Lord's house. There are some individuals who have made the good confession before men, been immersed—but gone no further—they have never once partook of those memorials by which the broken body and shed blood of our Lord are represented. In a public discourse I pointed it out as an imperative duty that if one were sick he should make it known, that all might suffer with him—"If any member suffer, let all suffer with it," &c.—and that there was no stronger symptom of disease than an entire refusal to eat. I also stated that if the curative means were neglected the wound might be so aggravated that if the member were not amputated it would unquestionably destroy the whole body. But all was of no avail. I therefore desire to know whether, on such occasions, amputation should not be resorted to.

J. S. FRISBEE.

Dear Brother—AMPUTATION is the last alternative, and only to be resorted to when an incurable gangrene has unequivocally exhibited itself. Affectionate expostulation, faithful admonition, the most tender and sympathizing exhortations, all that brotherly kindness and Christian compassion can do ought to be done to enlighten, stir up, and persuade to all obedience, to all goodness, and righteousness, and truth, before a member of the body of Christ is cut off and cast away. If this is faithfully and discreetly done, the weak, the ignorant, and the erring may be strengthened, corrected, and established in the faith. If these should fail the diseased will languish and die and leave you; or you must put them away as dead and withered branches, because they refuse submission to the Lord and have broken the everlasting covenant, in which they vowed to love, honor, and obey the Lord—to keep all his commandments and ordinances as delivered by the Apostles.

In much affection and esteem, ever yours in the Lord,

EDITOR.

COBOURG, *Upper Canada*, June 13, 1834.

WE have of late received interesting visits from brethren Moss, of Ohio, Thomas, of Batavia, New York; and Strait, of Beamsville, Upper Canada.

My whole soul is drawn out in the principles of the Reformation. I want to see those principles propagated every where.

The church to which I have the honor to be a member, met on the first day of the week to break bread, a practice we intend to continue as long as we live. We have of late received a very intelligent brother from the church at Dungannon, Ireland. We very frequently have accessions to our community, mostly from the world. JOSEPH ASH, Jun.

POMPEY, *New York*, June 7, 1834.

Brother Campbell—YOU will embrace the earliest opportunity to correct a mistake that appeared in brother Bartlett's letter on reform. He had been wrongly informed. The young man alluded to had never been at Auburn; nor is it certain he ever intended to be a Presbyterian Priest; if I mistake not, he always had too much good sense for that. He has been in other seminaries, and is a young man of promising talents.

The good work is in progress. I immersed three yesterday.

J. I. LOWELL.

BEAVER CREEK, *Maryland*, July 22, 1834.

THE good cause is going on at Beaver Creek. The number is about sixty that celebrate the first day of the week. Mr. Lancelot Bell has come out in the Reformation (a man that persecuted them them as much as Paul,) and is now proclaiming the good news with much success. SAMUEL KIZER.

HILLSBOROUGH, *Kentucky*, July 18, 1834.

I IMMERSED one last Lord's day, and on Monday attended a meeting with brother A. Maxey at Republican. Seven confessed the Lord Jesus, and were immersed with the *one* immersion; one of whom was a promising little girl, of 7 or 8 years old (as I suppose.) S. K. MILTON.

Mr. Meredith.

MR. MEREDITH, Editor of the *Baptist Interpreter*, Edenton, North Carolina, some time last winter proposed to examine our views, and alleged that we had not sustained certain positions with proper evidence. He called upon the advocates of our sentiments to meet him upon the questions at issue. The following gentlemen, W. R. Erwin, H. M. Robert, and James D. Erwin, seeing this special call in one of the *Interpreters*, immediately subscribed and paid for Mr. Meredith's paper for one year, with the stipulation that he was to give both sides, allowing us line for line and page for page in the *Interpreter*. Mr. Meredith declined, refusing to give both sides, or page for page, unless a majority of his subscribers should request him to do so. Thus ended the matter of the call.

The Editor, however, has filled some 45 or 50 columns of his paper with essays on "*Campbellism Examined*." Eight of these essays have been received at this office, and some two or three of them already read. When the author gets through we may, perhaps, make some remarks upon them. We have just now read the first number, and must do him the justice to say, that in it he writes like a gentleman. Courtesy and good manners are so extremely rare qualities in the ranks of the opposition, that it affords me pleasure to find an opponent, even one in a hundred, that has some respect for himself, and for what is commonly called "good breeding."

We hope Mr. Meredith has not abandoned the good maxims laid down in his first number, and we promise him a careful and candid hearing, if the Lord will.

We have only to regret that in his first essay he did not impugn some proposition in the Essays on Remission and Regeneration, against which he excepts, as laid down by us; instead of making by inference a proposition for us, and then complaining that we have not attempted to prove the proposition which he has done us the honor to submit for us. But of all this when he gets to port.

EDITOR.

QUERY. *Cincinnati, June* 21.

DO you think it constitutional for an evangelist to be an overseer of a church, inasmuch as the two offices are separate, and the duties distinctly different?

Answer.—I do not. A Christian Bishop may, however, labor in the word and teaching much of his time, and perform the duties of an overseer—just as the elders in Ephesus managed the oversight of the congregation and wrought with their own hands, if they followed the counsel and example of Paul. An elder or a bishop may, during the week, or at any time when the public duties of a bishop call not for his presence, do the work of an evangelist, as the elders who labored in the word and teaching were counted worthy of more honor than those who simply ruled well. But an evangelist cannot be the bishop of a congregation, while he does that work for the best reason in the world—because he cannot do two things at once. EDITOR.

Obituary.

DEPARTED this life on the 11th of May last, in the 42d year of her age, sister HAYDEN, consort of brother *Noah Hayden*, of Versailles, Ky. We heard only the other day of the decease of this intelligent and amiable sister. She was amongst the first in Woodford county to plead the cause of the ancient order of things: and from her great progress in Christian knowledge, sustained by the various excellencies of Christian character, she exerted a happy influence on the side of reformation. As she lived, so she died—unshaken in her confidence in God, and rejoicing in hope of the resurrection of the just. She has left a much afflicted husband, one son and four daughters, to follow her example—with whom we can sympathize; and while we would express our condolence, we pray that the good Lord may make the bereavement a blessing to them all!——*Ed.*

CHURCH IN BALTIMORE.

THE congregation in Baltimore commenced meeting in their new house about the first of July. It was erected under the constant superintendance of brother Carman; and is said to be one of the most comfortable and convenient meeting-houses in the city. It is as near the centre of the city as possible, being north of Market street, and but one square from the Post-Office. The floor is an inclined plane of 14 inches from the door to the baptistry. On the top of the baptistry stands the table from which the speaker addresses the audience. The table, though 21 inches high, is but 7 inches above the floor at the opposite end of the house, so that the speaker is seen and heard without much effort on his part or that of the audience.

Under date of the 8th ultimo brother Carman says, "All the expences have been borne by the church. From principle no person out of the church was asked for a cent. We think we might as justly ask for aid to build houses for ourselves to live in, as to solicit assistance to build a house for the church to meet in. We cannot countenance brethren in going from home, in imitation of the sects, soliciting aid to build meeting houses; and therefore we would not ask any. We are determined to carry out the principle. We will not countenance in others what we would not do ourselves; therefore, those who are not able to build meeting houses without asking aid, had better meet in private rooms or houses till they are able to build for themselves."

"The church is very comfortable, growing in knowledge and living in love and peace. There has been but little falling off amongst us when we think of the suddenness of many coming into the church. We see more of the wisdom of the commission in that provision of it which says, After preaching and baptizing, then teach them to observe what I have commanded."

DEFERRED ARTICLES.

SOME of the following came too late for insertion in the present number:—

Letters from J. A. Waterman.

Review of Samuel M'Corkle on the Prophecies, by "A Reformed Clergyman," Nos. 1, 2, and 3.

Henry Grew, on the phrase "*everlasting gospel.*"

Besides these, many other communications are on file; some, or all of which, as opportunity and prudence may decide, shall appear.

☞ OUR shelves are groaning under pamphlets and various *ephemerals*, on sprinkling infants, and on the identity of the Jewish and Christian Churches—requesting reviews. These are all in waiting for a more convenient season.

LINES written on the first leaf of a Bible, presented by a mother to her son. By whom written we know not; but they are full of beauty,

A Mother's Gift.

REMEMBER, son, who gave thee this,
When other days shall come;
When she who had thy earliest kiss,
Sleeps in her narrow home.
Remember 'twas a mother gave
The gift to one she'd die to save.

That mother sought a pledge of love,
The holiest for her son;
And from the gifts of God above,
She chose a goodly one.
She chose for her beloved boy
The source of light, and life, and joy.

And bade him keep the gift, that when
The parting hour should come,
They might have hope to meet again
In an eternal home.
She said his faith in that would be
Sweet incense to her memory.

And should the scoffer, in his pride,
Laugh that fond faith to scorn,
And bid him cast that pledge aside
That he from youth had borne;
She'd bid him pause, and ask his breast,
If he, or she, had lov'd him best.

A parent's blessing on her son,
Goes with this holy thing;
The love that would retain the one,
Must to the other cling.
Remember!—'tis no idle toy—
A mother's gift!—remember, boy!

☞CAUTION.☜

DOUBTLESS you have heard of the conduct of DOCTOR BENNET. He has done us much harm. He has been seen gambling, and has been going about selling diplomas for the Christian College. No doubt he has received donations on his tour to the East last summer. Please state in the Harbinger that one of our brethren saw him gambling. I had it from his own mouth Warn the public against him. J. S. ASHTON.

[I am sorry to have heard from other quarters that the disciples in various places have lost confidence in the professions of Dr. *Bennet*. "From such," Paul says, "turn away."] *Ed. M. H.*

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN.

PREFACE.

JAMES G. BELL, an intelligent, zealous, and amiable disciple of Christ, for some time an inmate in my family, labored for several years before his death under a pulmonary disease, which induced him to travel to the South in quest of health. He spent a considerable time in South Carolina; and finding his health not much improved, he returned to us for the express purpose of dying amongst his brethren. We often conversed much on the subject of the following pages; and so great was his desire for the promulgation of these sentiments, that in his last Will and Testament he left a small legacy (a part of which only has yet been received) which he wished me to use at discretion, in writing and publishing essays on the Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian Dispensations. This was the occasion of the essays which appeared on these topics in the *Christian Baptist*. In further prosecution of this object, and with especial reference to the present state of the BEGUN REFORMATION, we have devoted the following pages to a sketch of the essential outlines of the *Kingdom of Heaven*. This we soon perceived could not be done much to edification, unless we glanced at the whole economy of salvation, and kept before the mind of the reader the antecedent administrations of the favor of God to mankind; for the Patriarchal and Jewish Dispensations are essential to a full understanding of the doctrine of the Kingdom of Heaven.

This essay is written for the ten thousand, and not for a few of the scribes and elders of the people; and, therefore, we are as diffuse and familiar in our style as the nature of the subject would allow, to pay any regard to a methodical exposition of the grand elements of the Christian economy.

This essay is affectionately inscribed to the memory of JAMES G. BELL, at whose instance the subject was originally undertaken; who departed this life early in the year 1822, in the full assurance of a glorious immortality, and whose devotion to the Lord and love to the brethren will be long remembered with admiration by the writer.

A. CAMPBELL.

BETHANY, VA. *August* 16, 1834.

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER---EXTRA.

Number VII.

Bethany, Va. August, 1834.

Patriarchal Age of the World.

THE world had its infancy as well as man. Families preceded nations. Family worship was, therefore, the first religious institution.

At the head of this institution naturally stood *the Father of every Family*. From necessity, and from choice, he was the prophet, the priest, and the king of his household. As a *prophet*, he instructed his household in the knowledge of God and in the history of man. As a *priest*, he officiated at the family altar, interceded for those under his care, and pronounced benedictions upon his children. As a *lawgiver* and *king*, he commanded his children and servants, and rewarded them according to merit. By a divine ordinance the *first fathers of mankind* were thus constituted prophets, priests, and kings. Hence the first religious and political institution is properly called "*the Patriarchal.*"

Family worship was, then, the *first social worship;* and, during the first ages of the world (for at least 2500 years) it was the *only social worship* of divine authority. Though other institutions have since been added, this has never been superseded. Having its foundation in the matrimonial compact, the most ancient of all religious and political institutions, and this being founded on nature itself, it never can be superseded. While the forms of this worship have always been adapted to the genius of the various revelations of God vouchsafed to mankind, it has continued through all the changes of six thousand years, and will continue till the day when men, like the angels of God, shall neither marry nor give in marriage.

Family worship, so long as it continued the only social worship, underwent no material change; and this is the period which is properly called *the Patriarchal Age of the World*. So long as the descendants of one man and one woman continued under the paternal roof, or until they became heads of families themselves, they continu

ed under this religious and political administration. And if, after marriage, they did not migrate to a great distance from the patrimonial inheritance, the paternal authority was still acknowledged and acquiesced in. Thus, in process of time, he who at first was only the head of a single family, if his days were prolonged and his progeny multiplied, became the paternal prince or chief patriarch of a tribe.

In the youth of time and freshness of human nature families soon became large; and as the father and head could not be always present while he lived, and as he might die before all his children could have become heads of families, it became necessary that a substitute in his absence, and a successor in case of his premature death, should be appointed to fill his place and administer the affairs of the family. Nature and reason alike pointed to his first born son, and religion consecrated him his vicegerent. Hence the privileges and honors of the first born son were both religious and political; and thus the duties devolving upon him gave him a right to a double portion of the inheritance. Esau was, therefore, both *prodigal* and *profane* in selling his birthright for a meal of pottage.

The antiquity of this arrangement appears from the envy and jealousy of Cain, roused at the rejection of his offering and the acceptance of that of Abel. That jealousy seems to have been kindled into rage because of the birthright. This is fairly implied in God's address to Cain, when that address is fairly translated and understood. "If you do well, shall you not have the excellency; and if you do not well, sin precludes you (from the excellency.) And (Abel shall be subject to you) to you shall be his desire, and you shall rule over him." (1.)

The moral and religious institutions of the patriarchal or family worship, which continued from the fall of Adam to the covenant of circumcision, were the Sabbath, the service of the altar, oral instruction, prayer, praise, and benediction. With the addition of circumcision in the family of one patriarch, for special purposes, these were the parts of that system which continued for two thousand five hundred years.

The religious observance of weeks or Sabbaths in commemoration of Creation, and prospective of an eternal rest, to arise out of the sacrificial and typical institution, was religiously observed to the giving of the law, or the erection of the Jewish institution. Thus the law of the Sabbath commences with the words, "*Remember the Sabbath.*" The righteous always remembered the weeks, and regarded the conclusion of the week as holy to the Lord. Hence even after the Apostacy, which issued in the neglect of family worship, in consequence of the sons of God intermarrying with the daughters of men, and which brought a flood of water upon the world of the ungodly—we find Noah religiously counting his weeks even while incarcerated in the Ark. In the wilderness of Sin, before the giving of the law, we also find the Jews observing the Sabbath. And to facilitate the observance of it God wrought three special miracles during the perigrinations of Israel.

(1.) Genesis iv. 7.

He gave two days' portion of manna on the sixth day—none on the seventh—and preserved from putrefaction the portion laid up for the Sabbath. (1.)

Sin-offerings & thank-offerings, on altars both of stone and earth, were presented to the Lord—the former, in faith of the promise concerning the bruising of the Serpent's head by the offspring of woman—the latter, in grateful acknowledgment of the goodness of God in creation and providence. Cain, without faith in the promised redemption, like many deists and natural religionists in our time, did acknowledge the goodness and care of God by a thank-offering; but Abel, *by faith in that promise*, not only offered his thank offering, but a lamb as a sin-offering: therefore, while God respected not Cain's oblation without faith in that promise, he testified in favor of the *gifts* of Abel—he accepted his sin-offering and his thank-offering.

In the very brief and general outlines of almost two thousand five hundred years given us in the book of Genesis, we find sundry allusions to this part of the patriarchal institution. Immediately after his egress from the Ark, we find Noah rearing his altar upon the baptized earth, and of every clean bird and beast offering to the Lord whole burnt offerings. Thus began Noah, after the deluge, to worship the Lord according to the patriarchal institution. And thus we find Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Job, and other patriarchs presenting their sacrifices to the Lord, while the family worship was the only religious institution in the world.

Even libations, drink-offerings, and anointing as tokens of gratitude and consecration, are found in this most ancient and venerable institution. "Jacob rose up early in the morning, took the stone which he had put for his pillow, set it up for a pillar, and poured oil upon the top of it." (2.) "And Jacob set up a pillar in the place where God talked with him, even a pillar of stone, and he poured a drink-offering thereon, and he poured oil thereon." (3.)

A beautiful and instructive instance of ancient family worship, and of the sacerdotal functions, as exercised by the patriarchs in reference to *the Altar*, we have in that most ancient of books, supposed by many to have been written by Moses while in the land of Midian; but, according to others, by Job himself, who was certainly contemporary with *Eliphaz the Temanite*. Eliphaz was the son of Teman, who was the son of Eliphaz, who was the first son of Esau, the son of Isaac, the son of Abraham. He therefore lived before Moses. Thus we find him also officiating at the altar. We are told that "his sons went and feasted in each other's houses, every one his day, and sent and called for their sisters to eat and to drink with them. And it was so, that when the days of their feasting were gone about, that Job sent and sanctified them, and rose up early in the morning and offered burnt offerings according to the number of them all: for Job said, It may be that my sons have sinned and cursed God in their hearts. Thus acted Job continually." (4.)

(1.) Exodus xvi. 15—27. (2.) Genesis xxviii. 18.
(3.) Genesis xxxv. 14. (4.) Job i. 4, 5.

The same Job, by divine appointment, acted as priest or intercessor in behalf of his three friends, princes of Edom: for having spoken amiss, they were commanded to take seven bullocks and seven rams, and go to Job the servant of God, and to offer them up for themselves; and "Job my servant shall pray for you." "Job prayed for them, and the Lord accepted his prayer, and forgave Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar." "The Lord also accepted and blessed Job after he had prayed for these his friends, and the Lord turned again the captivity of Job." (1.)

During this period of the world there was but one high or general priest, specially called and sent by God. "He was King of Salem and Priest of the Most High God." To him the patriarch Abraham paid tithes or gave the tenth of the spoils taken in war, and Melchisedeck blessed him. He was of an order *sui generis*. He had no predecessor, successor, nor equal in the age of family worship.

From all these facts and documents we learn that the service of the altar belonged first to the father of the family—next, to his eldest son;—that it consisted in presenting sin-offerings and thank-offerings of various sorts in behalf of himself or family—that all pious sons and individuals might *for themselves* erect altars, offer sacrifices, and pour out libations and thank-offerings to the Lord;—that these sacrificial observances were generally, if not always, accompanied with prayer, intercession, and thanksgivings;—and that intercession in behalf of those under the care of any father or patriarch was a part of the first institution.

Benediction also was one of the duties of this office. Fathers pronounced blessings on their children. Superiors in age and standing blessed their inferiors. Melchisedeck blessed Abraham, Isaac blessed Jacob, and Jacob blessed the twelve patriarchs. The invocation of blessings and the imposition of hands upon the head, were parts of the family worship institution.

Concerning prayer and praise, as we cannot imagine a religion without them, it is unnecessary to speak particularly of them as parts of the patriarchal institution. Jubal soon taught men to handle the harp and the organ, and piety soon consecrated them to the praise of God. The melodies of nature soon taught man to tune his voice to God. Isaac went out into the fields at eventide for secret prayer. Abraham interceded for Sodom until he was ashamed to push his importunities farther; and for Abimelech, king of Egypt, and his family, he made his requests to God. Of him and his patriarchal character God said, "I know Abraham that he will command his children, and his household after him, and they shall keep the ways of the Lord, to do justice and judgment, that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he has spoken of him." (2.)

Prophets of a public character were occasionally raised up to bring men back to the primitive simplicity of the patriarchal institution, as well as to lead them forward to the future developments of God's purposes in reference to the work of redemption. Amongst these the

(1.) Job xlii. 8—10. (2.) Genesis xviii. 19.

most conspicuous were Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob. To all these were given new visions of the future, and thus they were all preachers of righteousness and reformers in their respective generations.

From these gleanings from the book of Genesis, one may learn that the family worship institution, which was divinely instituted in the first age of the world, embraced the observance of the Sabbath, the service of the altar, oral instruction, prayer, intercession, thanksgiving, and benediction. It contemplated no other bond of union than the marriage covenant and the relations springing out of it. Doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with God, were enforced in all its maxims, and in the examples of those whom God honored and approved.

There was, during the long period of this family institution, no community separated from the world larger than a single household—no public altars—no temples—no established order of public teachers; therefore, there was no initiating or separating institutions. There was no *circumcision* for the infant, nor *washing of regeneration* for the instructed. These institutions of later times had respect to public professing communities; and, therefore, for two thousand years there was no initiating rite or ordinance amongst men.

Wherever the family curtains were spread and a tent erected, the devout father built his own altar to the Lord, gathered his own children and domestics around him, instructed them in the knowledge of God the creator and preserver of all; and in the history of man, his origin and destiny, as far as revealed to them. They offered their thank-offerings, acknowledgments of favors received; and when conscious of sin, they presented their sin-offering, with confessions, and in faith of God's promise, supplicated pardon. Such are the essential attributes of the patriarchal institution, and of the family worship, as learned from the writings of Moses.

But as the root of all the subsequent dispensations of God's mercy and favor to man was planted in the patriarchal institution, it is necessary to our plan, before we advance farther, to pay some attention to one of these patriarchs, whose fame is eternal, on whom God bestowed an honor above all earthly honor, and who stands enrolled in the annals of time as THE FRIEND OF GOD. The intelligent reader needs not to be informed that we now call his attention specially to

Abraham.

Reader, attend! "I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob: this is my name forever, and this is my memorial to all generations." And shall not the name, the calling, the blessing, and the history of Abraham always occupy a large space in the records of God's government of man, and in all the details of his redemption!

Because of his unprecedented faith in God's promises and exalted piety, he was constituted the *father of all believers;* and his whole life is made a model for all the children of God, as far as walking by faith in God's promises is an ornament to human character.

Sufficient then to our present purpose, we observe, that *during the family worship institution*, a little after the commencement of the third Millennium, about the 75th year of his life, God appeared to Abraham while he yet lived in Ur of Chaldea, and commanded him to depart out of that country, and that he would do for him certain things. Abraham obeyed. God gratuitously tendered to him *two promises*, not only interesting and valuable to Abraham himself, but to all the human race.

These two promises were intended to be the basis of a two-fold relation to God, and the foundation of two distinct religious institutions called "the Old Testament and the New," "the Old Covenant and the New," "the Two Covenants," and "the Covenants of Promise." There was contemplated in them the constitution for a temporal and a spiritual kingdom of God—a kingdom of God of this world, and a kingdom of God not of this world. Be it, however, always remembered, when we attempt to form correct and comprehensive views of the whole economy of God's redemption, that these two promises were made while the patriarchal institution was yet standing and several centuries before its close. What, then, it will be asked, are these

Two Promises.

We find them in their most simple form in the beginning of the 12th chapter of Genesis. The first—

"*I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee and make thy name great, and thou shalt be a blessing. I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curses thee.*"

The second—"*In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed.*"

These promises when fully developed contained numerous blessings. They are, however, in all their details separate and distinct from each other. Abraham's family alone are personally concerned in the first—all families of the earth in the second. Temporal and earthly are the blessings of the former—spiritual and eternal are the blessings of the latter. Paul calls the second, "The gospel preached to Abraham," and "The covenant confirmed by God in reference to the Messiah, four hundred and thirty years before the giving of the law." The Jewish kingdom in all its glory was but the development of the first—the Christian kingdom in its present and future blessings is the consummation of the second.

Covenant of Circumcision.

In pursuance of the first promise, and in order to its exact and literal accomplishment, about twenty-four years after its promulgation the "*Covenant of Circumcision*" was established. This "covenant in the flesh" marked out and defined the natural descendants of Abraham, and gave to the world a full proof of the faithfulness of God, putting it in the power of every one to ascertain how God keeps his covenants of promise with all people. This gave to the descendants

of Abraham the title of "*The Circumcision*," and beautifully represented the separation of God's people from the children of this world.

The land of Canaan, as *the inheritance* of this nation, is repeatedly promised to Abraham; and as soon as Isaac, the child of promise, is born and circumcised, the promise of the "SEED," in which all nations were to be blessed, is confined to him. Not in Ishmael, but "in Isaac shall *thy seed* be called." (1.)

After the death of Abraham and towards the close of the life of Isaac, his father's God gave him a second edition of these two promises. The first is considerably amplified in its details, while the second is repeated almost in the same words. That which was first to be accomplished is first developed, and its provisions pointed out. "I will be with thee and will bless thee; for unto thee and to thy seed I will give all these countries, and I will perform all the oath which I sware to Abraham thy father; and I will make thy seed to multiply as the stars of heaven, and will give to thy seed all these countries; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed: because Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws." (2.)

The same two promises are repeated in almost the same words to Jacob the son of Isaac at the time he had the vision of the ladder reaching from earth to heaven, while in obedience to a command given him by his parents, he was on his way to Padan-aram in quest of a wife. On these *three* great occasions—to Abraham—to Isaac—to Jacob—these two promises are solemnly pronounced; always standing in the same order—never confounded; but as distinct as earth and heaven—as time and eternity.

Four hundred and thirty years after the first solemn declaration of these promises, the descendants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in virtue of the first promise, were redeemed out of bondage in Egypt, and saved from the tyranny and cruelty of Pharaoh. Then, in order to the *full completion* of its stipulations, God, by the hand of Moses, proposed a covenant with all Israel at Sinai; in which he guaranties to do all for them contemplated in the promise, confirmed by an oath to Abraham, in being a God to his seed after him. This

Sinaitic Covenant

constituted them a kingdom of God, a holy nation, a peculiar people. All the blessings comprehended in the first promise to Abraham, or that could grow out of the relation to God which it contemplated, were in full detail carried out into this transaction, and secured to the whole nation. The relation was, however, temporal, and its blessings temporal and earthly. The second promise made no part of the Jewish institution or covenant at Sinai, more than it did of the patriarchal or antecedent institution. The typical or figurative part of the family worship, enlarged and improved, was translated into the *national* institution and made a part of it; and whatever *spiritual* privilege was enjoyed by the Jew, was enjoyed upon the same princi-

(1.) Genesis xxi. 12. (2.) Genesis xxvi. 3, 5.

ple with the patriarch—by faith in the second promise, and by an intelligent and believing attendance upon all the appointed means which either prefigured the coming redemption, or realized the blessings which were to be derived through the promised seed.

The SEED in which all the families of the earth were to be blessed, was in the nation, but in no other sense than as it was in the people while in Egypt, or in the patriarchs before they went down into Egypt. It was in the nation, but no element of the national institution. They had the second promise made to their fathers, and all the faithful and approved among them believed that promise, and acted conformably to it. Thus amongst the Jews, even before the coming of the Messiah, there were

Two Seeds,

The natural and the spiritual children of Abraham. The whole nation were his literal and natural children; and such of them as believed the second promise and understood it, were not only his natural children, but his children in the same sense in which all *believing Gentiles* are by virtue of the second promise constituted the children of Abraham: *fer these two promises raised up two seeds to Abraham.* The first, like Ishmael, were born according to the flesh—the fleshly seed of Abraham; the second, like Isaac, were the children of faith in the promise: and thus Abraham is the constituted father of all who believe in that promise, whether of his flesh or not.

But the second promise was not fulfilled for nearly one thousand five hundred years after the first, or after the national institution was confirmed at Sinai; and therefore

The Blessing of Abraham,

Which was to come on the nations through his seed, through faith in the accomplished promise, was to be the basis and the substance of a new institution. This "blessing of Abraham" includes all the spiritual and eternal blessings which were laid up in his seed, who is the ark of this new constitution, in whom all the promises of God are verified, and in whom they are deposited for the comfort and salvation of all the children of God. Whatever concerned the family of Abraham coming through the first promise, descended upon the family principle, which is only *flesh;* but whatever concerns all saints of all nations, descends upon the new principle of *faith.* "They who are of faith," says Paul, "are blessed with believing Abraham." And "If you be Christ's, then," and only then, "are you Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise."

The blessing of Abraham was then promised in the patriarchal age antecedent to the Jewish national institution, and independent of it; therefore, that institution cannot affect, much less disannul, the blessings promised in the covenant, confirmed before by God, respecting the Messiah, in the time of family worship, and four hundred and thirty years before the Jewish institution began.

In calling Abraham, and in making him the father of many nations, and the depository of still more precious promises and revelations, God did not supersede the family worship. He only added to the stock of religious knowledge, strengthened the faith, and enlarged the hopes of that single family. The family institution continued without the slightest change, except in one particular specified in the covenant of circumcision, as respected the single family of Abraham, for four hundred and thirty years after the charter concerning his seed and that concerning the Messiah were secured to this renowned patriarch. Thus we have traced the continuance of the family religion, or patriarchal economy, for two thousand five hundred years, and are now prepared to make a few remarks on the Jewish national institution, though we have already anticipated almost all that is necessary to our present object. Still, however, we shall make it the subject of a distinct notice.

The Jewish Institution.

In this age of improvement in divine institutions, we read and hear much of "two dispensations of the covenant of grace;" thus making the Jewish and the Christian institutions dispensations of one "covenant of grace." Why not make the patriarchal, (still more venerable for its antiquity and which continued a thousand years longer than the Jewish,) also a dispensation of the covenant of grace, and then we should have had *three* dispensations of one covenant! This is but "a *show* of wisdom." The Holy Spirit calls them "two covenants," or "two institutions," and not two modifications of one covenant; and it speaks of each as established upon promises. The Jewish was established upon temporal and earthly promises, contained in the first promise made to Abraham; but the new, says Paul, "is established upon *better promises*," growing out of that concerning *the blessing of the nations* in the promised seed. (1.)

The Jewish institution commenced and continued about 1500 years before the Reign of Heaven began. It was not substituted for the family worship, but added to it; affecting, however, the patriarchal institution in some respects, as far as concerned the single family of Abraham. The individual families of the nation of the Jews, *as such*, had still their family worship—still the worship of God was heard in the dwellings of the righteous; and, like Joshua, every good Israelite said, "As for me and my family, we will serve the Lord."

In four hundred years the family of Abraham had, in the line of Isaac and Jacob, in fulfilment of the first promise, grown up into millions. Not less than two millions (2.) came up out of Egypt under the conduct of Moses. The heavenly Father, in progressive development of his plan of blessing all nations, leaves all the world under the family worship institution, and erects the whole progeny of Abraham

(1.) Jeremiah xxxi. 31.

(2.) Men fit for war are never more than the third or fourth of any population. There were six hundred thousand men of this class when they came to Mount Sinai.

that came up out of Egypt into one great national institution. He condescends to appear in the character of *King of the Jews*, and to make them *a kingdom of God*, as preparatory to the appearance of his *Son*, who is predestined to be the King of the whole earth, and to have a kingdom which shall ultimately embrace all the nations of the world.

The twelve tribes were brought into the form of one great worshipping family, presenting through one common High Priest their united worship to God. This gave rise to the erection of one public house consecrated to the Lord, as the place of meeting in their social and national character. A constitution, political, moral, and religious, was submitted to the people; and on their adoption of it, they became the covenanted people of God. This constitutional kingdom was built upon precepts and promises; and its worship when fully developed was little more than the extension of the family worship to one great national family. They had one king, one high priest, one national altar, one national house of God, one morning and evening sacrifice, one great national sacrifice, and one great annual atonement. The nation was a family of families, and whatever pertained to a single family in its family worship was extended and accommodated to this great confederate family.

Various mystic and significant institutions distinguished this nation from all others; for it was one principal object of its institution to keep its subjects separate and distinct from all other people till Messiah (the promised seed) should come. Another object was, to figure out in appropriate types the spiritual worship of the kingdom of heaven, and to exhibit the great doctrine of faith, repentance, remission, adoption, and inheritance, by picturesque images, ingeniously devised to figure out the whole doctrine of reconciliation and sanctification to God.

The Jewish institution is not to be regarded only in its political, moral, and religious aspect, but especially in its figurative and prospective character. God so wisely and benevolently contrived it from its origin to its close, that its whole history—the fates and fortunes of its subjects from their descent into Egypt, their travels thence to Canaan and settlement in the land of promise—their fortunes in that land to their final catastrophe, should exactly and impressively shadow forth the new institution with the fates and fortunes of the subjects of this new and more glorious order of things. "All these things happened to them for *types*," (examples,) says Paul, "and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world have come." The same great commentator on this institution not only presents the history of its subjects as instructive to the citizens of the new institution, but of the tabernacle he says, "It was a figurative representation for the time then present," and the furniture thereof "the pattern of things in the heavens." "The law," he adds, "contained only a shadow of the good things to come." A shadow, indeed, proceeding from a man, a house, a tree, is not, and cannot be, an exact image or representation of them; yet, when explained by a verbal description, it greatly facilitates an easy and correct conception of them.

So full of the doctrine of the new institution was the old, that we find all the Apostles and Christian writers unceremoniously applying every thing they quote from the law, the prophets, and the psalms, to the Messiah, his kingdom, and the fortunes of his people; as if the Jewish writings had no other object than to unfold the kingdom of heaven. Jesus begins with Abraham seeing his day on Mount Moriah in the typical resurrection of Isaac. Paul regards Hagar, Ishmael, Sarah, Isaac, as the best illustration of the *two institutions;* and John ends with the description of the descent of Jerusalem from heaven.

Every one, then, who would accurately understand the Christian institution must approach it through the Mosaic; and he that would be a proficient in the Jewish, must make Paul his commentator.—While the mere politician, moralist, or religionist contemplates the one without the other, though he may find much to admire in both, he will never understand either. A veil, thick as that which concealed the glory of the face of Moses from the Israelites, will hide the glory of the Jewish and Christian institution from his view.

Not only did the tabernacle, the temple, their furniture, the service of both, the priests, the sacrifices, the festivals, the convocations, and all the ordinances of that Ritual, together with the history of that people, assume the picturesque and figurative character, but almost all the illustrious and highly distinguished personages of that institution were made prophetic or typical of the Messiah, or of the great incidents of his life, sufferings, and triumphs, and the leading affairs of his government. Amongst *persons* in the patriarchal and Jewish ages, who, in one or more prominent characters or incidents, or in their general history adumbrated the Messiah and his reign, the following group occupy a lofty eminence:—Adam, Abel, Noah, Melchisedeck, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Aaron, Joshua, Samson, David, Jonah. Of *things* of this class, as well as persons highly figurative and instructive, are the vision of Jacob's ladder—the burning bush—the pillar of cloud and fire—the manna—the rock Horeb, a fountain of living water in the wilderness—the veil of Moses—the brazen serpent—the victory over the nations of Canaan, and the land of Canaan itself. And of *ordinances*, the passover, the scape goat, the red heifer, the year of jubilee, the law of the leper, the kinsman redeemer, the cities of refuge; together with all the sacrifices, washings, anointings, and consecrations of the *holy* nation.

But a third object of the Jewish institution, of paramount importance to the world, was the furnishing of a new alphabet and language (the elements of heavenly science,) without which it would appear to have been almost, if not altogether, impossible to learn the spiritual things, or to make any proficiency in the knowledge of those relations which Christianity unfolds. The language of the new institution is therefore explained by that of the old. No one can understand the dialect of the kingdom of heaven who has not studied the dialect of the antecedent administrations of heaven over the patriarchs and Jews. The most striking and characteristic attribute of the sacred

dialect is, that the elements of it are composed of the incidents of history, or what we call *remarkable providences.*

I cannot explain myself better, nor render my readers a more essential service, than by illustrating by an actual detail of sacred history, the following proposition, viz.— *That sacred history, or the remarkable incidents of God's providences to the Jews and Patriarchs, are the foundation of the sacred dialect of the new institution.* Or, if the reader will understand it better, it may be thus expressed—*All the leading words and phrases of the New Testament are to be explained and understood by the history of the Jewish nation and God's government of them.* Take the following as a mere specimen:—

God *called* Abram out of Ur, and changed his name into *Abraham;* and the name of his wife Sarai into *Sarah.* He *promised* Isaac as the person in whom his *seed* should be *called.* God did *tempt* Abraham, commanding him to *offer* Isaac for a burnt-offering—Isaac had two sons—Esau the elder, and Jacob the younger. Esau *despised* his *birthright* and *sold* it to Jacob. Jacob wrestled with God, and *prevailed*; he obtained a blessing, and was therefore called *Israel.* He had *twelve* sons: of these Joseph was his favorite. His brethren *envied* him, and *sold* him for twenty pieces of silver. Joseph *found grace* in the sight of his master. *The Lord was with Joseph.* He was cast into prison, and from thence was elevated to be the *governor* of Egypt under Pharaoh. A famine in Canaan compelled Jacob and his sons into Egypt for bread, and Joseph was *made known* to his brethren. Joseph died in Egypt and left his father's house in that land. They multiplied exceedingly, and the Egyptians greatly *afflicted* and *oppressed* the Israelites. *Moses* was born and exposed: Pharaoh's daughter found him and *adopted* him for a son. Moses fled into Midian, and married the daughter of the priest or prince of Midian, and kept his father-in-law's flock in the *desert,* and came to Horeb, *the mountain of God.* The Lord appeared to him in *a flame of fire* in a bush. The bush burned and was not consumed. Moses *drew near,* and then first stood on *holy ground.* God *sent* him to Egypt to lead *his people* out of *bondage.*

God bade him say to the *children of Israel,* "I AM has sent me to you. Gather the *elders* of Israel, and say to them, The *Lord God* of your fathers, the God of Abraham," &c. "has sent me to you. I will *smite* Egypt with my *wonders,* and *bring you up out of the afflictions* of Egypt. Tell Pharaoh, Israel is *my son—my first born.* Take Aaron with thee, and thou shalt *put words into his mouth;* and I will be *with thy mouth* and with his mouth: he shall be to thee instead of a mouth, and thou shalt be to him *instead of God.* Take thy *rod* in thy hand. The Lord *sent* Aaron to Moses: he met him in the mount and *kissed* him. And the Lord *visited* his people. And the people *believed when they heard* that the Lord had *looked upon* their affliction. Pharaoh oppressed them still more. The Lord said with a *strong hand* shall he let them go. I will *redeem* them with a stretched out arm and with great *judgments.* I will give you Canaan for a *heritage;* I will take you to me *for a people. I will be your God.*"

Moses said, I am a man of *uncircumcised lips*, and how shall Pharaoh *hearken* to me? I have made thee *a god* to Pharaoh, and Aaron *thy prophet*. I will multiply my *signs*, and bring out *my people*, and *harden* Pharaoh's heart. When he says, 'Show me a miracle,' cast your rod before him, and *it shall become* a serpent. Still Pharaoh refused, and *hardened his heart*. The magicians overcome with the *signs*, said, This is the *finger of God*. The *God of the Hebrews* said, Let *my people* go. I have *roused* thee up (as a lion) to show in you my power and to make *my name known* through *all the earth*. The Lord slew all the *first born* of Egypt after he had *plagued* them exceedingly. Pharaoh commanded them to depart; but he pursued them to the Red Sea. Israel fainted at the sight before and behind them. Moses said, Stand still and see *the salvation of God*. The sea was divided. Covered with a cloud, Israel marched through as on dry ground. The waters stood on either side as a wall. Pharaoh pursued with his chariots and horsemen, but the waters returned and they were drowned. Thus the Lord *redeemed, saved, delivered, and brought Israel out of bondage.*

After this deliverance Moses and the children of Israel sang, "The Lord is become *my salvation;* he is *my God.* Thou hast overthrown them that *rose up against thee.* Thou hast *led forth thy people* whom thou *hast redeemed.* Thou *hast guided them* in thy strength to thy *holy habitation.* The inhabitants of Canaan shall be still as a stone till *thy people* pass over, O Lord! the people *thou hast purchased.* Thou shalt plant them in the mountain of *thine inheritance*—in the *sanctuary* which *thy hands* have *established.*

They came into *the wilderness of Sin.* They cried for bread, and God *rained bread from heaven upon them*, that he might *prove* them whether or no they would *walk in his law:* and they did eat manna forty years, till they came to the borders of Canaan.

They complained for water, and tempted God. And Moses *smote the rock* in Horeb, and water gushed out. But Moses was wroth, and smote the rock twice; and he and Aaron thus *rebelled* against God, and fell in the wilderness. The Lord made a covenant with the whole nation at Sinai, and made them a *peculiar treasure* above all people—a *kingdom of priests*, a *holy nation;* and God *spake* all the words of the law, written on two tables of stone; and *spake to Israel from heaven.*

The Lord by Moses gave them directions for rearing a *tabernacle*, and a pattern for all its furniture. And as *a ransom for his soul*, every man, rich and poor, was to pay half a shekel as an *offering to the Lord*, to *make an atonement* for his soul; and it was given for *the service* of the tabernacle. When the tabernacle was reared and finished, *the glory of the Lord* filled the tabernacle and the *cloud* covered it. And when the cloud *was taken up* they journeyed; but until it was taken up they journeyed not. The *cloud* was on the tabernacle by day, and *fire* was on it by night, in the sight of all Israel throughout all their journeys.

And before Moses died he *laid his hands* upon Joshua, and gave

him a *charge* as the *Lord commanded;* and thus put *honor* upon him, that the children of Israel might be *obedient* to him as their *saviour.* "As I was *with Moses*, so will I be *with thee*," saith God; "I will not fail thee nor *forsake* thee."

Could we thus proceed with the history of this people, and add to their history the observances of their religious institutions, we should find out the true meaning of the sacred style of the New Testament with more accuracy and certainty, than from all the commentators of ancient and modern times. This, as a sample, must suffice for our present purpose.

From the premises now before us, the specifications of the outlines of the Sinaitic and national institution, and the terms and phrases found in the history of this people, we may discover in what *relation* they stood to God, and what *favors* he bestowed upon them in that relation.

They were the *called* and *chosen*, or the *elect* of God as a nation. As such, they were *delivered*, *saved*, *bought*, or *purchased*, and *redeemed.* God is said to have *created*, *made*, *formed*, and *begotten* them. As such, he is called their *Father*, their *God*, their *Redeemer*, their *King*, their *Saviour*, their *Salvation;* and they are called his *children*, *sons*, and *daughters*, *born to him*, his *house*, *people*, *inheritance*, *family*, *servants*.

As a *chartered* and congregated people, they are called *the city*, *the holy city*, *the city of the Lord*, *Jerusalem*, *Zion*, *Mount Zion*, *the city of David*. Other nations, in contrast with them, are called, *not a people*, *aliens*, *strangers*, *enemies*, *far off*, *unclean*.

Various similitudes expressive of the kind relation in which they stood to God, are also found on the pages of the ancient institution—such as *husband* and *wife*, *shepherd* and *flock*, *vine* and *vineyard*, *mother* and *children*. They are said to be *written* or *enrolled* in *the book of God;* to be *planted*, *washed*, *sanctified*, *clean*, *separated to God;* they are called the *house*, *building*, *sanctuary*, *dwelling place* of God; *a kingdom of priests*, *a holy nation*, *a peculiar people*, *saints*, &c. &c.

Those who are curious to trace these phrases descriptive of the relation and privileges of this ancient kingdom of God, had better (in addition to the passages quoted in their history from Egypt to the Jordan) examine the following passages:—Exodus xiv. 30. xv. 16. xix. 6. Deuteronomy iv. 37. vii. 6. x. 15. xiv. 1. i. 31. vii. 5. xxxii. 6, 18, 19. xviii. 7. iii. 18, 20. xii. 9. 1 Kings iii. 8. Psalms cv. 6. xxxiii. 12. cv. 43. cvi. 5, 21. lxxiv. 2. cxlix. 2. Isaiah xli. 8, 9. xliii. 1, 3, 5, 7. li. 2, 4. lxi. 5. lxiii. 16. i. 2. lxii. 1, 6, 7. xxviii. Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Psalms of David throughout, &c. &c.

Unless we should write a full treatise on these antecedent institutions, we cannot with propriety descend farther into details. The outlines, as far as subordinate to the theme of this essay, are now before the reader; and with this preparation we shall now invite his attention to THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN.

And why, an *American* will say, is it not called the *Republic* of Heaven, and the Chief called the *President* of a Celestial Republic?

Certainly there were the Republics of Greece and Rome before the doctrine of this Kingdom was first promulged, and the Gentiles as well as the Jews could have understood the figure of a Republic as well as that of a Kingdom. It was not, then, because there was not in society a model or type of this sort; but because such a type would have been inapposite to the nature of this institution.

History testifies that Republics are better adapted to peace than war, and that they are forced and unnatural organizations of society. Aristocracies and Republics owe all their attractions to the excessive corruptions of the governments under which they have originated. They are the reaction of force and fraud, of cruelty and oppression, and are sustained by the remembrance and apprehension of the evils which occasioned them. They have always been extolled and admired either in contrast with the vices and enormities of degenerate and profligate monarchies, or in the freshness of the recollections of the wrongs and outrages which occasioned them; and men have generally tired of them when they became corrupt and forgetful of the oppressions and crimes which forced them into being. So that the corruptions of Monarchies have given birth to Republics, and the corruptions of these have originated Monarchies again.

In these last days of degeneracy Republics are great blessings to mankind, as good physicians are blessings in times of pestilence; but yet it must be confessed that it would be a greater blessing to be without plagues and doctors. While men are, however, so degenerate, and while selfishness and injustice are so rampant in society, republican officers are better than kings—because we can get rid of them sooner. They are, indeed, kings under another name, with a short-leased authority; and our experience fully demonstrates that in these degenerate days the reigns of our republican kings are nearly long enough. Till the King of kings comes, we Christians ought to be good republicans, under the conviction that human governments seldom grow better, and that the popular doctrine of our country is true—that political authority generally makes a man worse, and public favors almost invariably corrupt the heart. Rapid rotation in office is the practical influence of the republican theory; and the experiment proves that, brief as republican authority is, it is sometimes too long for republican virtue to sustain without deterioration. Now if this be true of republican virtue, the brightest and the best, what earthly virtue can long resist the contamination of long protracted authority!

Monarchy is the only form of government, however, which nature recognizes. It was the first, and it will be the last. A government with three or thirty heads is a monster; and therefore the beast that represents it comes out of the sea with a plurality of horns as well as heads.

The most approved theory of human nature and of human government now current wherever the English language is spoken, either in the Old World or in the New, is, that a monarchy would be always the best government, because the cheapest, the most efficient, and the

most dignified; provided only, that the crown was always placed on the wisest head and the sceptre wielded by the purest hands. Could we always secure this we would all be monarchists; because we cannot, we are all republicans.

But after this apology for the phrase *Kingdom of Heaven*, we would recall the attention of the reader to the concession made by republicans themselves, that a kingdom is better adapted to a state of war, than a republic; and that this beautiful, because most appropriate figure, which occurs in the New Testament more than one hundred and fifty times, and very often in the Old, presupposes a state of war as existing in the universe. But for the reasons assigned in preference of monarchy, the *natural* government of the universe, always was, is, and evermore shall be monarchy. God himself is of necessity absolute monarch of the universe. Had he not essentially sustained that relation to all his creatures, there never could have been rebellion nor sin in his dominions. The systems of nature are all after this model. Every sun is a king over the system which it controls; and in every sphere there is one controlling and supreme principle. It will be the last government; for when the episode in the great drama of *rational* existence which sin occasioned, shall have been completed, the government of the universe will assume its ancient order, and God be supreme monarch again. But this will not be till Jesus gives up the kingdom to God, which a preternatural state of things put into his hands. This cannot be till he has subdued man to his rightful allegiance, or destroyed forever every opponent to the absolute monarchy of the Eternal Supreme: "for Jesus must reign till all his enemies be put under his feet."

The kingdom which Jesus has received from his Father, however heavenly, sublime, and glorious it may be regarded, is only temporal. It had a beginning, and it will have an end; for he must reign only *till* all enemies are put under his feet. But the transition of the sceptre into the hands of Emanuel has not changed the nature of the government. He is now the hereditary Monarch of the universe, as well as the proper King of his own kingdom. He now reigns as absolutely over all principalities, hierarchs, and powers, celestial and terrestrial, as did the great God and Father of the universe, before he was invested with the regal authority.

We have said it was a preternatural state of things which originated the kingdom of Jesus: therefore the object of this remedial reign is to destroy that preternatural state of things, or to put down sin. Now as all human governments presuppose disorder, and as the kingdoms of this world generally have arisen out of confusion and war, this kingdom of heaven of which we are to speak owes its origin to the celestial and terrestrial apostacies—the revolt of Satan and of Adam. Were there not injustice within, or violence without, civil government would be wholly unnecessary, and its appendages an excrescence upon society. Had there not been such a revolt and rebellion as sacred history records, there would have been no such kingdom of heaven as that over which Jesus the Messiah now presides. Now as

both this King and kingdom, and all that appertains to them, were occasioned by such a preternatural state of things, we must view them in all their attributes and details, with reference to those circumstances which called them into being.

The Elements of a Kingdom.

We must understand the type, or we cannot understand the antitype. We must understand that which is natural before we can understand that which is spiritual. What, then, are the essential elements of a kingdom as existing among men? They are five—viz. King, Constitution, Subjects, Laws, and Territory. Such are the essential parts of every political kingdom, perfect in its kind, now existing on earth.

In *forming a state*, the essential elements are people and country. The people make a constitution, and this makes a President or a King, citizens or subjects, and every thing else belonging to a state. It is, then, the relation into which the people resolve themselves, which makes it a republic, an aristocracy, a monarchy. Do they choose a monarchy? They first make a constitution, and this places one upon the throne—makes them subjects, and he gives them laws. Although the constitution is first, in the order of nature, of all the elements of a kingdom, for it makes one man a king and the rest subjects; yet we cannot imagine a constitution in reference to a kingdom, without king and subjects. In speaking of them in detail, we cannot then speak of any one of them as existing without the others—we must regard them as correlates, and as coming into existence contemporaneously. There is no husband nor wife before marriage, neither can there be a husband without a wife; yet one of the parties must be made before the other. Marriage makes a husband out of the groom, and a wife out of the bride. So the constitution makes the king or the governor; the citizens or subjects, out of the people, as the case may be: for there never can be a king or subject without a constitution, or, what is the same thing, an agreement, verbal or written, for certain privileges stipulated and conditioned. In every well regulated political kingdom, *in the order of nature*, the elements stand thus—1. Constitution; 2. King; 3. Subjects; 4. Laws; 5. Territory.

In the kingdom which God set up by Moses, the elements stood in this order. The constitution was first proposed under which God condescended to be their King, and they were to be regarded as his people or subjects; he then gave them laws and established them in the territory before promised.

But in the kingdom of nature, or in the original kingdom of God, the elements are only four, and the order in which they stand, are—1. King: 2. Subjects; 3. Laws; 4. Territory. As Father and Creator of that kingdom, God himself was absolute Sovereign, whose will is the supreme law of the whole realm of nature.

Having ascertained the essential elements of a *kingdom*, and marked

the order in which they stand, before we particularly attend to these elements in order, we shall ask why this kingdom is called the Kingdom of *Heaven?*

The Name

Heaven, and the Kingdom of Heaven are not one and the same thing. God is not the Kingdom of God. But as the kingdom of God is something pertaining to God, so the kingdom of heaven is something pertaining to heaven, and consequently to God. Whether always the phrases "the kingdom of God" and "the kingdom of heaven" exactly represent the same thing, certain it is that both phrases are often applied to the same institution. (1.)

This is true of them whether translated *reign* or *kingdom*; and it is very evident that frequently the original word *basileia* ought in preference to be rendered *reign*, inasmuch as this term better suits all those passages where *coming* or *approaching* is spoken of: for while reigns or administrations approach and recede, kingdoms have attributes and boundaries which are stationary. Reign and Kingdom of God, though sometimes applicable to the same subject, never contemplate it in the same light. They are, indeed, as intimately connected as the reign of King William and the Kingdom of Great Britain. The former represents the administration of the kingdom, and the latter the state over which this administration extends.

Two good reasons may be offered why Matthew, the oldest Christian writer, generally prefers Kingdom or Reign of *Heaven*, to the phrase Kingdom or Reign of *God:* I say *generally*, for he occasionally uses *both* designations. (2.) He wrote to Jews in Judea who expected a Messiah, a King, and a kingdom of God on *earth*, a mere improvement of the Jewish system; and, therefore, to raise their conceptions, he delights to call it the Reign or Kingdom of *Heaven*, in contrast with that earthly kingdom of God, of which they were so long in possession.

He also found a good reason in the idiom of the Jewish prophets for using the word *Heaven* (both in the singular and plural form) for *God*. Daniel told the Assyrian monarch that his kingdom would be sure to him when he should have learned that "the *Heavens* do rule;" yet, in the preceding verse, he says, "Till thou knowest that the Most High rules in the kingdom of men"—thus using *Heavens* and *the Most High* as synonymous. The Psalmist says, "The wicked set their mouths against the *Heavens*." The Prodigal confesses that he had "sinned against *Heaven*," and Jesus himself asked whether the baptism of John was "from *Heaven* or from men." Thus he was authorized from the Jewish use of the word to regard it as equivalent to *God*. If, then,

(1.) If the following passages are carefully examined and compared, it will appear that both these phrases often represent the same thing:—Math. iii. 17. Mark i. 14. Luke iv. 43.—Math xiii. 12. Mark iv. 11. Luke viii. 10.—Math xi. 11. Luke vii. 28. To these three distinct evidences many more might be added. What Matthew calls "the Kingdom of *Heaven*, Mark and Luke call "the Kingdom of *God*."

(2.) See chapters vi. 33. xii. 28. xix. 24. xxi. 31, 43.

Matthew had meant no more by the phrase "Kingdom of Heaven" than the "Kingdom of God," he was justified by the Jewish use of the word *heaven*, to apply it in that sense. Some may object to all these remarks upon Matthew's manner, that it was Jesus Christ and the preachers he commissioned who called it the Kingdom of Heaven, and not Matthew Levi. To such we reply, that the other sacred writers uniformly, in reciting all the same parables and incidents, use the phrase "Kingdom of God," and *never* the phrase "the Kingdom of Heaven."

From his use of the phrase "Kingdom of God," we must, I think, regard him as having special reference to the reason first assigned. He does not say the Kingdom of *Heaven* shall be taken from the Jews; but, "The Kingdom of *God* shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits of it:" for although it might with propriety, in his acceptation, be said, that the Jews already had the kingdom of God, it could not be said that they had the kingdom of *Heaven* as proclaimed by Matthew. (1.)

When compared with the earthly kingdom of God among the Jews, it is certainly the kingdom of *Heaven:* for Jesus alleges that his kingdom is not of this world; and Daniel affirmed that in the days of the last worldly empire the God of Heaven would set up a kingdom unlike all others then on earth; in which, as Paul teaches, men are "blessed with every spiritual blessing in heavenly places in Christ:"† for he has *raised* us Jews and Gentiles, and "has set us down together in the heavenly places by Christ Jesus." (3.)

There is, in the superior and heavenly privileges and honors bestowed upon the citizens of this kingdom, the best reason why it should have first been presented to the world under this title, rather than any other; and, for the same reasons which influenced Matthew to usher it into notice in Judea, under this designation, we ought now to prefer it; because many of our contemporaries, like the ancient Jews, see as much of heaven and glory in the veiled grace of the Mosaic institution, as in the unveiled grace of the Christian kingdom. The pertinency of this title will appear still more evident as we develope the constitutional privileges of this kingdom.

But most evidently the kingdom of Heaven is "*the kingdom of Christ and of God.*" (4.) It is the kingdom of God because he set it up, (5.) gave the constitution and King, and all the materials out of which it is erected. (6.) It is the kingdom of Christ, because God the Father gave it to him as his Son, and as the *heir of all things;* and therefore, "all that is the Father's is mine," says Jesus, "and I am his." (7.) "*God created all things* BY *Jesus Christ and* FOR *him.*"

Having, then, noticed the reasons for the characteristic *titles* of this kingdom, and having already ascertained what are the elements absolutely essential to a kingdom, distinguished from those merely circumstantial or accidental, we shall now proceed to consider, in the order suggested, the Constitution, King, Subjects, Laws, and Territory of the Kingdom of Heaven.

(1.) Matthew xxi. 43. † Eph. i. 3. (3.) Eph. ii. 6. (4.) Eph. v. 5.
(5.) Daniel ii. 44. (6.) Jer. xxxi. 31—34. (7.) John xvii. 18.

Constitution.

God himself, after the gracious counsels of his own will, proposed and tendered the constitution of this kingdom to his own Son. This "glory he had with the Father before the world was." He that was "in the beginning with God"—"*the wisdom and power of God*"—was set up [constituted] from everlasting, or ever the earth was." "Then was I with God, as one brought up with him; I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him—rejoicing in the habitable parts of his earth; and my delights were with the sons of men" (1.) Therefore, he who was to be "*ruler in Israel*" was with God in counsel "in the beginning of all his ways;" for "his goings forth were from old, even from the days of eternity." (2.)

It was TO DO THE WILL, or fulfil the items in this constitution, that "*the* WORD was made flesh and dwelt among us." "I came to *do the will* of him that *sent* me," and to finish "the work *given* me to do." "I have power to lay down my life, and I have power to resume it; this commandment I received from my Father." The Father "commissioned and sent him forth into the world." He "came down from heaven." "Thou hast given me power over all flesh, that I might give eternal life to all that thou hast given me."

These, and many other passages which the reader will easily remember, unequivocally evince that an understanding and agreement existed ere time began between God and the WORD of God—or, as now revealed, between the FATHER and the SON, respecting this kingdom. In consequence of which, "the *Word* was made flesh and dwelt among us"—in consequence of which, "he divested himself" of his antecedent glory—"took upon him the form of a bond-servant"—"was made in the likeness of sinful flesh"—"took part with us in flesh and blood." In consequence of which agreement, and the promised glory, for 'the joy set before him in the promise,' of "seeing his seed, the travail of his soul, and being satisfied," "he endured the cross, despising the shame," and "was made perfect through sufferings to lead many sons to glory."

To the stipulations concerning eternal life, propounded in the constitution of the kingdom of heaven, frequent allusions are made in the Apostles' writings. Thus the believers were "elected in *him* before the foundation of the world," and "eternal life was promised before the times of the ages," "according to the benevolent purpose which *he purposed in himself* for the administration of the fulness of the appointed times, to gather together all under Christ—all in the heavens and all on the earth, under him." He formerly marked us out for an adoption through Jesus Christ to himself, according to his purpose, who effectually works all things according to the counsel of his will. (3.)

From all these sayings and allusions, we must trace the constitution of this kingdom into the days of eternity—before time began. We must date it from *everlasting*, and resolve it into the absolute gracious

(1.) Prov. viii. 23—31. (2.) Micah v. 21. (3.) Eph. i. 3—12.

will of the eternal God. In reference to all the prospective developments of time, "known to God from the beginning," it proposed to make the WORD flesh, and then to make the incarnate Word, called Emanuel, or Jesus Christ, the *King*, to give him all who should be reconciled to God by him for *subjects*, to put under him all the angelic hosts, and constitute him monarch of heaven and earth, *lawgiver* to the universe; and thus make him heir and Lord of all things.

As a constitution brings all the elements of a kingdom into a new relation to one another, so it is the measure and guarantee of all the privileges, immunities, and obligations accruing to all the parties in that relation. It prescribes, arranges, and secures all the privileges, duties, obligations, honors, and emoluments of the King and the subjects. Neither of them can claim more than it stipulates and guaranties, and neither of them can rightfully be deprived of any of them.

From the premises now before us, and the light given to us in these scriptures and those in the margin, we learn—

1. That God is the author of the constitution of the kingdom of heaven; that he propounded it to the WORD that was made flesh, before the world was, in prospect of all the developments of creation.

2. That the WORD accepted it, because the will of God was always his delight; therefore he said, "I come to do thy will, O God!" Hence "*God* has so loved the world as to give his only begotten Son, that whosoever believes on him may not perish, but obtain eternal life."

3. That in consequence "all *authority* in heaven and earth" was given to Jesus Christ, and all orders of intelligence subjected to him, that he might be *King* over all, and have the power of giving eternal life to his people. (1.)

4. That the earth is now the Lord's, the present temporal territory of his kingdom; that the heathen people are given to him for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession; that all ends of the earth are his, and all dominions, kindreds, tribes, tongues, and people shall yet serve him on earth, and glorify him in heaven. (2.)

5. That all that he redeems are his seed—his subjects: that he will have their faith, confidence, esteem, admiration, and gratitude forever: that he will be worshipped, honored, and revered by them in a world without end: that God, angels, and saints will delight in him forever and ever. (3.) He has, therefore, to raise the dead, judge the world, and to present the redeemed pure, holy, happy, and triumphant before his Father, and then to give up the kingdom to God.

To comprehend, in any adequate degree, the constitution of this kingdom, we must learn more than its history, or the way in which it was introduced and propounded. We must regard all the elements of the kingdom as *constitutional* elements—the King as a constitutional King; the subjects, laws, and territory, including the ultimate inheritance, as constitutional subjects, laws, territory, inheritance; and, therefore, we shall speak of them in detail.

(1.) Matthew xxviii. *id.* ii. 44. vii. 27. (2.) Psalms ii. 6—8. lxxii. 2—18. Dan. (3.) Revel. v. 9—14. xiv. 1—5. xvi. 3, 4. xxi. 9—27. Eph. i. 20, 21.

The King.

The Lord Jesus Christ is the constitutional monarch of the kingdom of heaven. The privileges guarantied to him in reference to the kingdom are the following:—

As King, he is to be the *oracle* of God—to have the disposal of the Holy Spirit—to be Prophet and High Priest of the Temple of God—to have the throne of his Father—to be Governor of all nations on earth, and head of all hierarchs and powers in heaven—the supreme Lawgiver, the only Saviour, the resurrection and the life, the ultimate and final Judge of all, and the Heir of all things.

These honors, privileges, and powers are secured to him by the irrevocable grant of the God and Father of all; therefore, as said Isaiah, "The Lord cometh with a strong hand, and his arm shall rule for him. Behold, his reward is with him, and his work before him." "I have set my King upon my holy hill of Zion." "Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." "I have made him a leader and a commander to the people"—"a light to the Gentiles"—"salvation to the ends of the earth"—"a Priest forever after the order of Melchisedeck." "Sit thou at my right hand till I make thy foes thy footstool." "The government shall be upon his shoulders." "All things are delivered to me of my Father." "He is Lord of the dead and living." "Angels, authorities, and powers are subjected to him." "The Father gave the Spirit without measure to him." "He received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit." "The kingdom is the Lord's, and he is the governor among the nations." "He shall have dominion from sea to sea, and from the Euphrates to the ends of the earth." "They shall fear thee as long as sun and moon endure to all generations." "The Father has committed all judgment to the Son."

But, not to weary the reader with quotations and proofs, we shall give but another:—"Behold my servant, whom I uphold; my elect, in whom my soul delights. I have put my Spirit upon him. He shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not fail nor be discouraged till he have set judgment in the earth; and the Isles shall wait for his law.—I, the Lord, have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thy hand and keep thee, and give thee for a *covenant* [a CONSTITUTION] of the people for a *light* to the Gentiles—to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison-house." (1.)

The Subjects of the Kingdom.

They are all born again. Their privileges and honors are the following:—

1. Their constitutional King is the only begotten Son of God; whose title and honors are—image of the invisible God—effulgence of the Father's glory—Emanuel—upholder of the universe—Prophet of the Prophets—High Priest of the Temple of God—King of kings

(1.) Isaiah xlii. 1—7. xlix. 8.

—Lord of lords—the only Potentate —Commander and Covenant of the people—Captain of Salvation—Counsellor, Lawgiver, Redeemer, Deliverer, Mediator, Saviour, Advocate, Judge. He is Sun of Righte ousness, Prince of Peace, Lamb of God, Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root and the Offspring of David, the bright and Morning Star, Light of the World, the Faithful and True Witness, Bishop of Souls, Great Shepherd of the Sheep, Head of the Church, Lord of all, Heir of the Universe, the Resurrection and the Life, the Son of Man, the Alpha and the Omega, the Beginning and the End, the Amen, &c. &c. &c. Such is the Christian's King, whose assistance in all these characters, offices, and relations, as exhibited under all these figures, is guarantied to him in the Constitution. Indeed it is all expressed in one promise—"*I will be your God, and you shall be my people.*"

2. It is guarantied that "their sins and iniquities are to be remembered no more." "There is no condemnation to them who are under Christ." "Sin shall not have dominion, nor lord it over them." The Lord imputeth to them no sin. They are all pardoned, justified, and saved from sin.

3. They are adopted into the family of God; made sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty; children of God, and heirs—joint heirs with Christ. They have an Advocate in the heavens, through whom their persons and prayers are accepted.

4. They all know the Lord. "All thy children shall be taught of God." The Holy Spirit of God writes the law of God upon their hearts, and inscribes it upon their understanding: so that they need not teach every one his fellow-citizen to know the Lord, "for they all know him from the least to the greatest." They are all sanctified through the truth—separated and consecrated to God.

5. They have the promise of a resurrection from the dead, and eternal life; an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and unfading—new heavens and a new earth, in which righteousness alone shall dwell forever.

Such are the constitutional rights and privileges of the citizens of the kingdom of heaven. And these have obtained for them the following titles and honors:—"Kingdom of heaven; Israel of God; chosen generation; body of Christ; children of God; habitation of God; family of God; Jerusalem from above; Mount Zion; peculiar people; the elect of God; holy nation; temple of the Holy Spirit, house of God; city of the living God; pillar and ground of the truth; living stones; seed of Abraham; citizens of heaven; lights of the world; salt of the earth; heirs of God; joint heirs with Christ, &c. &c. &c.

These privileges, honors, and emoluments belong to every citizen of the kingdom of heaven. Indeed, they are all comprehended in the summary which Paul (from Jeremiah) lays before the believing Hebrews:—"This is the constitution which I will make with the house of Israel after those days: I will put my laws into their mind, and inscribe them upon their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people. And they shall not teach every

man his fellow-citizen, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for all shall know me, from the least of them to the greatest of them; because I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and iniquities I will remember no more." (1.) To this summary the reader may add those scriptures in the margin as confirmatory of the above. (2.)

The Laws of the Kingdom.

The supreme law of this kingdom is *love*—love of the King and love of each other. From this law all its religious homage and morality flow. Precepts and examples innumerable present this to the mind of all the citizens. The kingdom of heaven is divided into small societies, called *churches*, or *congregations of the Lord*. Each of these communities in the reception of members, in the education and discipline of them, or in excluding them when necessary, is to be governed by the apostolic instructions: for to the Apostles the Saviour committed the management of his kingdom. After they had made citizens by preaching the gospel and baptizing, they were commanded to teach them to observe whatsoever the Saviour had commanded them.

These laws and usages of the Apostles must be learned from what the Apostles published to the world, after the ascension and coronation of the King, as they are recorded in the Acts of the Apostles and Epistles: for we shall see in the sequel that the gospel was fully developed, and the whole doctrine of the Reign of Christ *began* to be proclaimed in Jerusalem on the first Pentecost after the ascension.

The old, or Jewish constitution, was promulged first on Sinai on the first Pentecost after the redemption of Israel from Egyptian bondage; and from that day, and what is written after it in Exodus and Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy, all the laws, manners, and customs authorized by the national constitution are to be found. They are not to be sought after in Genesis, nor in the antecedent economy. Neither are the statutes and laws of the Christian kingdom to be sought for in the Jewish scriptures, nor antecedent to the day of Pentecost; except so far as our Lord himself, during his life time, propounded the doctrine of his reign. But of this when we ascertain the *commencement* of this kingdom.

There is one universal law of naturalization, or for making citizens, out of all nations, enjoined upon those citizens of the kingdom who are engaged in the work of proselytism; but the laws of this kingdom, like the laws of every other kingdom, are obligatory only on the citizens.

The weekly celebration of the death and resurrection of Jesus, and the weekly meeting of the disciples of Christ for this purpose, and for the edification of one another in their most holy faith, are the only

(1.) Hebrews viii. 10—13. (2.) Rom. vi. 5, 6, 14. viii. 1, 33—39. 1 Cor. vi. 11. Eph. i. 7. ii. 6, 19, 21, 22. Col. i. 13, 14. 1 Peter ii. 5—7. 2 Peter i. 10, 11. 1 John ii. 2.

positive statutes of the kingdom; and, therefore, there is no law, statute, or observance in this kingdom, that in the least retards its extension from East to West, from North to South, or that can prevent its progress in all the nations of the world.

It is, however, worthy of observation, that every part of the Christian worship in the small communities spread over the territory of the kingdom of heaven, like so many candlesticks in a large edifice, are designed to enlighten and convert the world; and, therefore, in all the meetings of the family of God, they are to keep this supremely in view; and to regard themselves as "the pillar and ground of the truth."

Concerning the details of the laws of the kingdom, we cannot now speak particularly. "The favor of God which brings salvation, teaches all the citizens of heaven, that, denying all ungodliness and worldly lusts, they should live soberly, righteously, and godlily in this present world, expecting the blessed hope—namely, the appearing of the glory of the great God, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify to himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." These things the Bishops of every community should teach and enforce; for such is the spirit and such is the object of all the laws and statutes of the kingdom of heaven.

The Territory.

In all other kingdoms, except the kingdom of heaven, the territory is the national domain and inheritance. It was so in the first kingdom of God under the constitution from Sinai. But in the typical kingdom they lived at a distance from their inheritance for one generation. During these forty years, in which they pitched their tents in the wilderness, *God was their inheritance.* He rained bread from heaven upon them, and sent them flesh on the east wind. He made the flinty rock Horeb a living spring, whose stream followed them all the way to Jordan. He renewed their garments every day, so that for forty years they grew not old, nor needed a single patch. A pillar of fire by night and a cloud by day guided them on towards Canaan, the land of their inheritance.

The whole earth is the present territory of the kingdom of heaven, but the new heavens and earth are to be its *inheritance.* The earth, indeed, is the Lord's and the fulness thereof; but the children of God and the children of the wicked one—the *wheat* and the *darnel*, are both planted in it, and must grow together till the harvest. The righteous have their bread and water guarantied to them while they live; for "godliness is profitable to all things, having *promise of the life that now is*, as well as of that which is to come." But the joint heirs with Christ are never taught to regard the earth as their inheritance. They may indeed say, though poor and pennyless, "All things are ours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come—all are ours, and we

are Christ's, and Christ is God's." But, like the Jews on their journey to Canaan, "they seek a better country"—"they seek a city yet to come." "My kingdom," says Jesus, "is not of this world" And, therefore, in the world Christians are strangers and pilgrims, and may expect tribulation.

The earth is the present *theatre of war;* therefore all Christians in the territory are *soldiers.* Their expences are borne, their rations are allowed, the arms and munitions of war are supplied them from the magazines in Mount Zion, the strong hold and fortress of the kingdom; where the King, the heads of departments, and all the legions of angels are resident. So that on entering the Army of the Faith every soldier is panoplied with the armor of God; and when inducted into the heavenly tactics under the Captain of Salvation, he is expected to be a good soldier of Jesus Christ, and to fight the good fight of faith courageously and victoriously.

The kingdom of heaven on this territory is greatly opposed by the kingdom of Satan, which ever seeks to make an *inheritance* out of the territory of the militant kingdom of righteousness; and, therefore, the citizens have not to wrestle with flesh and blood, but with the rulers of the darkness of this world—with spiritual wickedness in high places.

Ever since the commencement of this kingdom, the governments of this world have either been directly opposed to it, or, at best, pretended friends; and, therefore, their influence has always been opposed to the true spirit and genius of the Christian institution. Christians have nothing to expect from them except liberty of conscience and protection from violence, while leading peaceable and quiet lives, in all godliness and honesty, till Jesus take to himself his great power, and hurl all these potentates from their thrones, and make his cause triumphant—a consummation devoutly to be wished, and which cannot now be regarded as far distant.

Manners and Customs.

Touching *the manners and customs* of the kingdom of heaven, they are such as generally obtained in the land of Judea and in the East at the time of its erection; or, rather, they are the simple manners and customs of the *family worship age* of the world. These are consecrated by simply performing them with a regard to Jesus Christ, or from the motives prompted by the doctrine of the Reign of Heaven. As we treat our natural brothers and sisters in public and in private—as we address, salute, and converse with them—as we transact all family business, and conduct the affairs of the household—so are Christians to treat one another. There is no other virtue or utility in these, than as they cherish brotherly kindness and love, and are regarded to the Lord.

Induction into the Kingdom of Heaven.

Into every kingdom, human or divine, there is a legal door of admission. This is, in the statute book of heaven, called a *birth.* Into

the kingdom of nature we are born. Into the future and ultimate kingdom of glory we enter, soul and body, by being born from the grave. As Christ, the first born from the dead, entered the heavenly kingdom, so must all his brethren. And as to this kingdom of which we speak, as now existing in this world, Jesus himself taught that into it no person can legally enter who is not born again, or "*born of water and the Spirit.*" (1.) The analogy is complete between the kingdoms of nature—of grace—and of glory. Hence we have natural birth, metaphorical or spiritual birth, and supernatural birth. There is a being born of the flesh—born of the Spirit—born of the grave; and there is a kingdom for the flesh—a kingdom for the Spirit—and a kingdom for the glorified man.

This second, or new birth, which inducts into the kingdom of God, is always subsequent to a death and burial, as it will be into the everlasting kingdom of glory. It is, indeed, a literal death and burial before a literal resurrection, into the heavenly and eternal kingdom. It is also a metaphorical or figurative death and burial, before the figurative resurrection or new birth into the kingdom of heaven. Water is the element in which this burial and resurrection is performed, according to the constitutional laws of the kingdom of heaven. Hence Jesus connects the water and the Spirit when speaking of entering this kingdom of God.

In naturalizing aliens the commandment of the King is first to submit to them the Constitution, or preach to them *the gospel of the kingdom.* Soon as they understand and believe this, and are desirous of being translated into the kingdom of Christ and of God, that "they may receive the remission of sins and inheritance among all that are sanctified," they are to be buried in water, into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and raised out of it confessing their death to sin, their faith in Christ's sacrifice and resurrection; and thus they are born of water and the Spirit, and constituted citizens of the kingdom of heaven.. *To as many as thus receive him he gives privilege to become the children of God;* for they are "*born of God*"—born of God, when born of water and of the Spirit, because this is the institution of God.

In these days of apostacy men have sought out many inventions. Some have attempted to get into the kingdom of heaven without being born at all. Others imagine that they can be born of the Spirit, without water, and that the King is as well pleased with them who have been born without a mother, as with those who are lawfully born of father and mother. Others think that neither Spirit nor water is necessary; but if they are politically born of the flesh, they can enter the kingdom as rightfully as the Jewish circumcised infants enter the earthly kingdom of Israel. But as we have no faith in any modern improvements of the gospel, change or amendment of the constitution of the kingdom of heaven, we must leave them to account to the King himself, who "*have transgressed the law, changed the ordinance, and broken the everlasting covenant;*" and proceed to the question,

(1.) John iii. 5. Titus iii. 5. (2.) Isaiah xxiv. 5.

The Coming of the Kingdom.

When did the kingdom of heaven commence? 'With the ministry of John,' says one;—'With the ministry of Jesus,' says another;—'With the first sending out of the Twelve Apostles,' says a third;—'At the resurrection of Jesus,' says a fourth;—'At none of them: but by degrees from the baptism of John to the fall of Jerusalem,' says a fifth.

The reader will please remember that there are at least *five elements* essential to a perfectly organized kingdom, and that it may be contemplated in reference to one or more of these component parts. Hence the numerous and various parables of the Saviour. Sometimes he speaks of the administration of its affairs—of its principles in the heart—of its subjects—of its King—of its territory—of its progress—of various incidents in its history. Hence the parable of the sower—of the wheat and darnel—of the leaven—of the merchant seeking goodly pearls—of the grain of mustard seed—of the sweep net—of the marriage of a king's son—of a nobleman going into a far country—of the ten virgins—of the talents—of the sheep and goats, present to our view the kingdom of heaven in different attitudes, either in its elements or in its history—its commencement or its close.

The approaching, or the coming of the reign of heaven, can properly have respect only to one or two of the elements of a kingdom; or to the formal exhibition of that whole organization of society which we call *a kingdom.* It can have no proper allusion to its territory; for that was created and located before man was created. It cannot allude either to the persons who were constituted subjects, for they too were in existence before the kingdom commenced. It cannot allude to the birth or baptism of the King, for it was not till after these that Jesus *began* to proclaim its coming or approach. It cannot have reference to the ministry of John or of Jesus, any more than to the patriarchal or Jewish dispensations; because Jesus did not begin to proclaim the coming of this reign *till after John was cast into prison.* This is a fact of so much importance, that Matthew, Mark, and Luke distinctly and circumstantially declare, that, in conformity to ancient predictions, Jesus was to begin to proclaim in *Galilee*, and *that he did not commence to proclaim the doctrine or the gospel of the coming of the Reign, till after John's ministry ceased and he was cast into prison.* In this assertion the Evangelists agree:—"Now Jesus [after his baptism and temptation in the wilderness] hearing that John was imprisoned, retired into Galilee; and having left Nazareth, resided at Capernaum. For thus saith the Prophet," &c. From that time Jesus *began* to proclaim, saying, "*Reform, for the Reign of Heaven approaches;*" or, "The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand," as says the common version. (1.)

Some Baptists, for the sake of *immersion*, and some of our brethren in the Reformation, for the sake of *immersion for the remission of sins*, seem desirous to have John in the kingdom of heaven, and to date the

(1.) Matth. iv. 12. Mark i. 14. Luke 3. 20. iv. 14.

commencement of the Christian dispensation with the first appearance of John the Immerser. They allege in support of this hypothesis that Jesus said, "The Law and the Prophets continued till John," (the only instructers of men;) "since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presses into it." "Publicans and harlots show you the way into the kingdom of heaven," said Jesus to the Pharisees. Again, "Alas! for you Scribes and Pharisees! for you shut the kingdom of heaven against men, and will neither enter yourselves, nor permit others that would, to enter." "The kingdom of God is within you." "The kingdom of heaven has overtaken you." From these premises they infer that the kingdom of heaven was actually set up by John the Baptist: 'For,' say they, 'how could men and women *enter into a kingdom* which was not set up? And did not John immerse for the remission of sins, and call upon men to repent and reform in order to baptism?'

The Paidobaptists, too, will have Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Moses, David, and all the circumcised Jews in the kingdom of heaven, because Jesus said, "Before Abraham was, I am;" "Abraham saw my day and was glad;" and Paul says Moses esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than all the treasures of Egypt, and forsook Egypt in faith of the Christian recompense of reward. Yes, and Paul affirms that Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and their families, who dwelt in tents in the promised land, looked not only to the rest in Canaan, but they sought a heavenly country, and expected the city of foundations, whose builder and maker is God. Thus the Jews had Christ in the manna and in the Rock, and baptism in the cloud and in the sea.

The mistake is specifically the same. Christ was promised and prefigured before he came, and the kingdom of heaven was promised and preached by John, by Jesus, the Twelve, and the Seventy, (who went about proclaiming the glad tidings of the Reign) before the reign of Christ, or kingdom of heaven, commenced. Because Christ was promised and prefigured in the patriarchal and Jewish ages, the Paidobaptists will have the kingdom of heaven on earth since the days of Abel; and because the glad tidings of the reign and kingdom of heaven and the principles of the new and heavenly order of society were promulged by John, the Baptists will have John the Baptist in the kingdom of heaven, and the very person who set it up.

Let us, then, examine this matter with all candor: and first we shall place the passages above quoted out of the testimonies of the Evangelists on one side, and the following passages on the other side; and then see if we can reconcile them. John says, "Reform, for the reign of God approaches." Jesus began to proclaim, saying, "Reform, for the reign or kingdom of heaven is at hand." He also commanded the Twelve and the Seventy to perigrinate all Judea, making the same proclamation. (1.) Of John the Baptist he said, though greater than all the Prophets, "The least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he."

(1.) Math. x. 8. Luke x. 1–11. When eating the last supper he distinctly said that the reign of God was then future. Luke xxii. 18.

Thus after John was beheaded we have some eighty-four preachers daily proclaiming the nigh approach of the reign of God; and Jesus often assuring his disciples that the kingdom of God was soon to appear, and that some of his companions would see him enter upon his reign before they died—and yet the kingdom was set up by John! Scribes and Pharisees were shutting the kingdom against men, when Jesus had only given the keys to Peter! John the Baptist was in the kingdom, and the least in the kingdom is greater than he! More than eighty preachers say, "Reform, for the reign of heaven is at hand;" and John the Baptist before he died introduced all Judea and Jerusalem into it! How, then, shall we reconcile these apparent contradictions? Make both sides figurative, and it may not be done. Regard both sides literally, and it cannot be done! To say that the kingdom came in one point of view at one time, and in another point of view at another time, is only to say that it came in different senses—literally and figuratively. For our part we must believe that the kingdom of heaven began, or the reign of heaven literally and truly commenced in one day.

Many of its principles were developed by the ancient Prophets: David, Isaiah, and others wrote much concerning it; John the Baptist proclaimed its immediate and near approach, and more fully developed its spiritual design; therefore, he was superior to them. Jesus often unfolded its character and design in various similitudes; and every one who understood and received these *principles* were said to "press into the kingdom," or to have "the kingdom within them;" and wherever these principles were promulged "the kingdom of heaven" was said to "come nigh" to that people, or to "have overtaken them;" and those who opposed these principles and interposed their authority to prevent others from receiving them, were said to "shut the kingdom of heaven against men;" and thus all those scriptures must of necessity be understood from the contexts in which they stand: for it was impossible that the reign of heaven could literally commence "*till Jesus was glorified*," "received the promise of the Holy Spirit," was "made Lord and Christ," and "sat down with his Father upon his throne"—for he left this earth *to receive a kingdom.**

To make this, if possible, still more evident, we ask, *When did the kingdom of God, established by Moses amongst the seed of Abraham, cease?* This question penetrates the whole nature and necessity of the case: for will any one suppose that there were two kingdoms of God on earth at one and the same time? Certainly the one ceased before the other began.

Now that the kingdom of God, ministered by Moses, had not ceased during the personal ministry of the Messiah on earth, is, we think, abundantly evident from the following facts and documents:—

1. Jesus was to have appeared, and did appear, "*in the end of the world*," or last days of the first kingdom of God. "In the conclusion of the age has he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." The "world to come" was one of the names of the gospel age.

*Luke xix. 11—15.

He has not subjected "the world to come" to the angels, as he did the world past, says Paul to the Hebrews. He appeared, then, not in the beginning of the gospel age, but in the end of the Jewish age.

2. The Temple was the house of God to the very close of the life of Jesus. For it was not till the Jewish ministry conspired to kill him that he deserted it. At the last festival of his life, and immediately before he fell into their hands, on walking out of the Temple, he said, "Behold your house is deserted," for you shall not see me henceforth till you shall say, Blessed be he that comes in the name of the Lord!" It was his Father's house, the house of God till that moment. Then, indeed, the glory departed.

3. The Jewish offerings and service, as a divine institution, continued till the condemnation of Jesus. He sent the cleansed leper to the priest to make the offering commanded in the law. He commanded the people to hear the doctors of the law who sat in Moses' chair. He paid the didrachma. He was a minister of the circumcision. He lived *under*, not *after* the law. He kept all its ordinances, and caused all his disciples to regard it in its primitive import and authority to the last passover. *Indeed, it could not be disannulled, for it was not consummated till on the cross he said,* "IT IS FINISHED."

4. When he visited Jerusalem the last time, and in the last parable pronounced to them he told them plainly 'the kingdom of God should be taken from them' and given to a nation who should make a better use of the honors of the kingdom; consequently at that time the Jews had the kingdom of God.

5. It was not until his death that the veil of the Temple was rent; that the things "which could be shaken were shaken." It was then, and not till then, that he nailed the legal institution to his cross. Then, and not till then, was the middle wall of partition broken down. The last Sabbath he slept in the grave. *From the moment of his death there was no life in the old kingdom of God.* The Temple was deserted, its veil rent, its foundation shaken, the city devoted, the ritual abolished, and as after death the judgment, the Temple, city, and nation waited for the day of his vengeance.

The kingdom of God was evidently in the Jewish institution till Jesus died. Hence the kingdom of heaven came not while Jesus lived. In anticipation they who believed the gospel of the kingdom received the kingdom of God, just as in anticipation he said, "I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do" before he began to suffer; and as he said, "This cup is the new testament in my blood, shed for the remission of the sins of many," before it was shed. So while the doctrine of this reign—faith, repentance, baptism, and a new principle of sonship to Abraham were promulging by John, the Twelve, the Seventy, and by himself, the kingdom of heaven was approaching; and those who received these principles by anticipation were said to enter into the kingdom, or to have the kingdom within them.

The principles of any reign or revolution are always promulged,

debated, and canvassed before a new order of things is set up. A party is formed upon these principles before strength is acquired or a leader obtained competent to the commencement of a new order of things. In society, as in nature, we have first the blade, next the stem, and then the ripe corn in the ear. We call it wheat, or we call it corn, when we have only the promise in the blade. By such a figure of speech the kingdom of God was spoken of while as yet only its principles were promulging.

When these American states were colonial subjects of the King of England, and long before the setting up of a Republic, republican doctrines were promulged and debated. The believers and advocates of these doctrines were called Republicans, while as yet there was not a republic on this continent. He who dates the commencement of the kingdom of heaven from the ministry of John the Baptist, sympathizes with him who dates the American Republics from the first promulgation of the republican principles, or from the formation of a republican party in the British colonies. But as a faithful and intelligent historian, in writing the history of the American Republics, commences with the history of the first promulgation of these principles, and records the sayings and deeds of the first promulgers of the new doctrines; so the sacred historians began their history of the kingdom of heaven with the appearance of John in the wilderness of Judea, preaching the Messiah, faith, repentance, a holy life, and *raising up a new race of Israelites on the principle of faith rather than of flesh:* for this in truth was "the blade" of the kingdom of heaven.

Having from all these considerations seen that until the death of the Messiah his kingdom *could not* commence; and having seen from the record itself that it *did not* commence before his resurrection, we proceed to the development of things after his resurrection, to ascertain the day on which this kingdom was set up, or the reign of heaven began.

The writer to whom we are most indebted for an orderly and continued narrative of the affairs of the kingdom of heaven, is the Evangelist Luke. His history begins with the angelic annunciations of the nativity of John and Jesus, and ends with the appearance of the great standard-bearer of the Cross in Imperial Rome, A. D. 64. That part of his history to which we now look as a guide to the affairs of the commencement of the Reign, is the notices which he makes of the *forty days* which the Lord spent in his crucified body, previous to his ascension. The reader ought not to be told (for he ought to know) that Jesus rose in the same body in which he was crucified, and in that reanimated fleshly body did eat, drink, and converse with his Apostles and friends for forty days. That body was not changed till, like the living saints who shall be on the earth at his second personal coming, it was made spiritual, incorruptible, and glorious at the instant of his ascension. So that the man Christ Jesus was made like to all his brethren in his death, burial, resurrection, transfiguration, ascension, and glorification; or rather, they shall be made to resemble him in all these respects.

The Apostles testify that they saw him ascend—that a cloud received him out of their sight—that angels descended to inform them that he was taken up into heaven, not to return for a long time—that he ascended far above all the visible heavens, and now fills all things. Stephen, when dying, saw him standing on the right hand of God.

Much attention is due to all the incidents of these forty days—as much, at least, as to the forty days spent by Moses in the Mount with God in the affairs of the preceding kingdom of God. For the risen Messiah makes the affairs of his approaching kingdom the principal topic of these forty days. (1.) Towards the close of these days, and immediately before his ascension, he gave the commission to his Apostles concerning the setting up of this kingdom. "All authority in heaven and in earth is given to me: go, *therefore*," said he, "convert the nations," [announce the gospel to every creature,] "immersing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe *all the things* which I have commanded you; and behold! I am with you always, even to the conclusion of this state." (2.) "But continue in the city of Jerusalem until you be invested with power from on high." Thus according to his promise and the ancient prophecy, it was to "*begin at Jerusalem*." (3.)

The risen Saviour thus directs our attention to Jerusalem as the *place*, and to a period distant "not many days," as the *time* of the beginning of his reign. The great facts of the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus, not being yet fully developed to his Apostles, they were not qualified to take any steps to the setting up of a kingdom which was to be *founded upon Christ crucified.* They needed an interpreter of these facts, and a supernatural advocate of the pretensions of the King, before they could lay the foundation of his kingdom.

Again, the King himself must be glorified before his authority could be established on earth; for till he received the promise of the Spirit from his Father, and was placed on his throne, the Apostles could not receive it; so that Christ's ascension to heaven and coronation were indispensable to the commencement of this reign of heaven.

Here let us pause for a moment—leave the earth, and on the wings of faith in the testimony of Prophets and Apostles, the two witnesses for Jesus, let us follow him to heaven and ascertain his reception into the heaven of heavens, and exaltation to the right hand of God.

The Ascension of the Messiah.

Prophets and Apostles must now be heard. David, by the Spirit, says, "The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels; the Lord is among them as in Sinai in the holy place. Thou hast ascended on high; thou hast led captivity captive; thou hast received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious, that the Lord God might dwell among them." (4.) The same Prophet, in speaking of the solemn and joyful procession at the carrying up of the ark of the ancient con-

(1.) Acts i. 3. (2.) Matth xxviii. 19, 20. Mark xvi. 16. Luke xxiv. 47, 48 (3.) Isaiah ii. 3. Micah iv. 2. (4.) Psalm lxviii. 18.

stitution into Mount Zion, turns his eyes from the type to the antitype, and thus describes the entrance of the Messiah into heaven:—"Who shall ascend into the hill of God?" The attendant angels in the train of the Messiah, approaching the heaven of heavens, shout, "Lift up your heads, O you gates! be lift up, you everlasting doors, and the King of glory shall come in." Those within, filled with astonishment that any one should so confidently demand admission into those gates so long barred against the sons of men, responsive shout, "Who is the King of glory?" The angels in attendance upon the Messiah reply in strains still as triumphant, "The Lord, strong and mighty! the Lord, mighty in battle!" and still more exultingly triumphant, shout, "Lift up your heads, O you gates! even lift them up, you everlasting doors, and the King of glory shall come in. Who is this King of glory? He is the Lord of hosts! he is the King of glory!" (1.)

Coronation of the Messiah.

Every thing in its proper order. He that ascended first descended. Jesus died, was buried, raised from the dead, ascended, and was crowned Lord of all In the presence of all the heavenly hierarchs, the four living creatures, the twenty-four seniors, and ten thousand times ten thousand angels, he presents himself before the throne. So soon as the first born from the dead appears in the palace royal of the universe, his Father and his God, in his inaugural address, when anointing him Lord of all, says, "Let all the angels of God worship him"—"Sit thou at my right hand, till I make thy enemies thy footstool." "Jehovah shall send out of Zion [Jerusalem] the rod of thy strength: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies, [the city of thy strongest foes.] Thy people, willing in the day of thy power, shall come to thee. In the beauty of holiness, more than the womb of the morning, shalt thou have the dew of thy progeny. The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a Priest forever after the order of Melchisedeck. The Lord at thy right hand shall strike through the kings [that oppose thee] in the day of his wrath." "Thy throne, O God, endures forever: the sceptre of thy kingdom is a sceptre of rectitude. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, thy God, has anointed thee with the oil of joy above thy fellows. Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thy hand: they shall perish, but thou remainest; and they shall all grow old as does a garment, and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed; but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail." (2.)

Thus God highly exalted him, and did set him over all the works of his hands, and gave him a name and an honor above every name in heaven and on earth, that at the name of Jesus glorified every knee should bow, and every tongue confess, to the glory of God.

"Now we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, that he might taste death for all, on account of the sufferings of death,

(1.) Psalm xxiv. (2.) Psalms xc. c. and Heb. i.

crowned with glory and honor"—Now "angels, authorities, principalities, and powers are subjected to him." "His enemies will I clothe with shame, but upon himself shall his crown flourish."

The Holy Spirit, sent down by Jesus from heaven, on the Pentecost after his resurrection, to the disciples in attendance in Jerusalem, informs the Apostles of all that had been transacted in heaven during the week after his ascension, and till that day. Peter now filled with that promised Spirit, informs the immense concourse assembled on the great day of Pentecost, that God had made that Jesus whom they had crucified both Lord and Christ—exalted him a PRINCE and a Saviour to grant repentance to Israel and remission of sins.

The first act of his reign was the bestowment of the Holy Spirit, according to the prophecy of Joel and his own promise. So soon as he received the kingdom from God his Father, he poured out the blessings of his favor upon his friends; he fulfilled all his promises to the Apostles, and *forgave three thousand of his fiercest enemies.* He received pardons and gifts for them that did rebel, and shed forth abundantly all spiritual gifts on the little flock to whom it pleased the Father to give the kingdom. Thus commenced the Reign of Heaven, on the day of Pentecost, in the person of the Messiah, the Son of God, and the anointed Monarch of the Universe. Under him, his people, saved from their sins, have received a kingdom which cannot be shaken nor removed.

But as the erection of the Jewish tabernacle, after the commencement of the first kingdom of God, was the work of some time, and of united and combined effort, on the part of those raised up and qualified for the work; so was the complete erection of this new temple of God. The Apostles, as wise master builders, laid the foundation—promulged the constitution, laws, and institutions of the King, and raised the standard of the kingdom in many towns, cities, and countries, for the space of forty years. Some of them not only saw "the Son of Man enter upon his reign," and the kingdom of God commence on Pentecost, and carry its conquests over Judea, Samaria, and to the uttermost parts of the earth; but they saw the Lord "come with power" and awful glory, and accomplish all his predictions on the deserted and devoted temple, city, and people. Thus they saw a bright display of the golden sceptre of his grace in forgiving those who bowed to his authority, and an appalling exhibition of the iron rod of his wrath in taking vengeance on his enemies who would not have him to reign over them.

Present Administration of the Kingdom of Heaven.

During the personal absence of the King, he has committed the management of this kingdom to stewards. These were, first, Apostles; next in rank to them, Prophets; next, teachers; then, assistants, or helpers; then directors or presidents, all furnished with gifts, knowledge, and character, suited to their respective functions. Be-

sides these, many persons possessed of miraculous powers—gifts of healing and speaking foreign languages, were employed in setting up and putting in order the communities composing the kingdom of heaven. Angels also were employed, and are still employed, under the great King in ministering to them who are heirs of salvation. For Jesus now, as Lord of all, has the Holy Spirit at his disposal, and all the angels of God; and these are employed by him in the affairs of his kingdom. (1.)

The Apostles were plenipotentiaries and ambassadors for Jesus, and had all authority delegated to them from the King. Hence every thing was first taught and enjoined by them. They were the first preachers, teachers, pastors, overseers, and ministers in the kingdom, and had the direction and management of all its affairs. (2.)

The communities collected and set in order by the Apostles were called *the congregations of Christ*, and all these taken together are sometimes called *the kingdom of God*. But the phrases "church of God," or "congregation of Christ," and the phrases "kingdom of heaven," or "kingdom of God," do not always nor exactly represent the same thing. The elements of the kingdom of heaven, it will be remembered, are not simply its subjects, and therefore not simply the congregations of disciples of Christ. But as these communities possess the oracles of God, are under the laws and institutions of the King, and therefore enjoy the blessings of the present salvation, they are, in the records of the kingdom, regarded as the only constitutional citizens of the kingdom of heaven; and to them exclusively belongs *all the present salvation*. Their King is now in heaven, but present with them by his Spirit in their hearts and in all the institutions of his kingdom.

Every immersed believer, of good behaviour, is, by the constitution, a free and full citizen of the kingdom of heaven, and entitled to all the social privileges and honors of that kingdom. Such of these as meet together statedly in one place in obedience to the King, or his ambassadors the Apostles, for the observance of all the institutions of the King, compose a family, or house, or congregation of Christ; and all these families or congregations, thus organized, constitute the present kingdom of God in this world. So far the phrases *kingdom of heaven* and *the congregation* or *body of Christ* are equivalent in signification. (3.)

Now in gathering these communities, and in setting them in order, the Apostles had, when alive, and when dead, by their writings still have, the sole right of legislating, ordering, and disposing of all things. But it is not the will of Jesus Christ, because it is not adapted to human nature, nor to the present state of his kingdom as administered in his absence, that the church should be governed by a *written* document alone. Hence in every city, town, and country where the Apostles gathered a community by their own personal labors, or by their assistants, in setting them in order, for their edification, and for

(1.) 1 Cor. xii. 28. Eph. iv. 11. Heb. i. 14.
(2.) 2 Cor. iii. 6. v. 18—20. (3.) Rom. xii. 4—8. 1 Cor. xii. 27. Heb. iii. 6.

their usefulness and influence in this world, they uniformly appointed Elders, or overseers, to labor in the word and teaching, and to preside over the whole affairs of the community. To these also were added *Deacons*, or public *ministers* of the congregation, who, under the direction of the overseers, were to manage all the affairs of these individual families of God. This the very names *Bishop* and *Deacon*, and all the qualifications enjoined, fairly and fully import.

But as all the citizens of the kingdom are free men under Christ, they all have a voice in the selection of the persons whom the Apostles appoint to these offices. The Apostles still appoint all persons so elected, possessing the qualifications which they, *by the Holy Spirit*, prescribed. *And if a congregation will not elect to these offices the persons possessing these qualifications; or if by a waywardness and selfwilledness of their own, they should elect those unqualified, and thus disparage those marked out by the possession of those gifts; in either case, they despise the authority of the Ambassadors of Christ, and must suffer for it.* It is, indeed, the Holy Spirit, and not the congregations, which creates Bishops and Deacons. The Spirit gives the qualifications, both natural and acquired, and, speaking to the congregations in the written oracles, commands their ordination or appointment to the work. (1.)

In the present administration of the kingdom of God, *faith is the* PRINCIPLE, *and ordinances the* MEANS *of all spiritual enjoyment.* Without faith in the testimony of God, a person is without God, without Christ, and without hope in the world. A Christless universe, as respects spiritual life and joy, is the most perfect blank which fancy can create. Without faith nothing in the Bible can be enjoyed; and without it, there is to man no kingdom of heaven in all the dominions of God.

In the kingdom of nature *sense* is the *principle*, and *ordinances* the *means* of enjoyment. Without sense, or sensation, nothing in nature can be known or enjoyed. All the creative, recuperative, and renovating power, wisdom, and goodness of God, exhibited in nature, are contained in ordinances. The sun, moon, and stars—the clouds, the air, the earth, the water, the seasons, day and night, are therefore denominated the *ordinances* of Heaven, because God's power, wisdom, and goodness are *in* them, and felt by us only *through* them. (2.) Now sense, without the ordinances of nature, like faith, without the ordinances of religion, would be no *principle* of enjoyment; and the ordinances of nature, without sense, like the ordinances of religion, without faith, would be no *means* of enjoyment. These are the unalterable decrees of God. There is no exception to them; and there is no reversion of them. To illustrate and enforce the doctrine of this single paragraph is worthy of a volume. The essence, the whole essence of that reformation for which we contend, is wrapped up in this decree as above expressed. If it be true, the ground on which we stand is firm

(1.) Acts vi. 2—7. xiv. 23. xx. 17—36. Philip. i. 1. 1 Tim. iii. 1—16. Titus i. 5—10. Heb. xiii. 7, 17, 24.

(2.) Jeremiah xxxi. 35, 36. Job xxxviii. 31—33. Jeremiah xxxiii. 25.

and unchangeable as the Rock of Ages; if it be false, we build upon the sand. *Reader, examine it well!*

In the kingdom of heaven faith is, then, the *principle*, and ordinances the *means* of enjoyment; because all the wisdom, power, love, mercy, compassion, or *grace of God*, is in the ordinances of the kingdom of heaven; and if all grace be in them, it can only be enjoyed through them. What, then, under the present administration of the kingdom of heaven, are the ordinances which contain the grace of God? They are, preaching the gospel—immersion in the name of Jesus, into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit—the reading and teaching the Living Oracles—the Lord's day—the Lord's supper—fasting—prayer—confession of sins—and praise. To these may be added other appointments of God, such as exhortation, admonition, discipline, &c: for these also are ordinances of God; and, indeed, all statutes and commandments are ordinances: (1.) but we speak not at present of those ordinances which concern the good order of the kingdom, but of those which are primary means of enjoyment. These primary and sacred ordinances of the kingdom of heaven are the means of our individual enjoyment of the present salvation of God.

Without the sun, there is no solar influence; without the moon, there is no lunar influence; without the stars, there is no sidereal influence; without clouds, there can be no rain; and without the ordinances of the kingdom of heaven, there can be no heavenly influence exhibited or felt. There is a peculiar and distinctive influence exerted by the sun, moon, and stars; yet they all give light. So in the ordinances of the kingdom of heaven—although they all agree in producing certain similar effects on the subjects of the kingdom, there is something distinctive and peculiar in each of them, so that no one of them can be substituted for another. Not one of them can be dispensed with—they are all necessary to the full enjoyment of the reign of heaven.

In nature and in religion all the blessings of God bestowed on man are properly classed under two heads. These may be called, for illustration, *antecedent* and *consequent*. The antecedent include all those blessings bestowed on man to prepare him for action and to induce him to action. The consequent are those which God bestows on man through a course of action correspondent to these antecedent blessings. For example, all that God did for Adam in creating for him the earth and all that it contains, animal, vegetable, mineral; in forming him in his own image; giving him all his physical, intellectual, and moral powers, and in investing him with all the personal and real estate which elevated him above all sublunary beings, were antecedent to any act of Adam; and these furnished him with inducements to love, honor, and obey his creator and benefactor. All that God did for Abraham in promises and precepts before his obedience—all that he did for the Israelites in bringing them up out of Egypt, and redeeming them from the tyranny of Pharaoh, were antecedent

(1.) James i. 25.

to the duties and observances which he enjoined upon them, and to the privileges which he promised them. And all the blessings which Adam, Abraham, the Israelites enjoyed through conformity to the institutions under which they were placed, were consequent upon that state of mind and course of action which the antecedent favors demanded and occasioned. *God never commanded any being to do any thing but the power and motive were derived from something God had done for him.*

In the kingdom of heaven the antecedent blessings are the constitution of grace, the King, and all that he did, suffered, and sustained for our redemption. These were finished before we came upon the stage of action. This is all favor, pure favor, sovereign favor: for there can be no favor that is not free and sovereign. But the remission of our sins, our adoption into the family of God, our being made heirs and inheritors of the kingdom of glory, are consequent upon faith and the obedience of faith.

Organization and life of any sort are of necessity the gifts of God; but health and the continued enjoyment of life, and all its various and numerous blessings, are consequent upon the proper exercise of these. He that will not breathe, eat, drink, sleep, exercise, cannot enjoy animal life. God has bestowed animal organization and life antecedent to any action of the living creature; but the creature may throw away that life by refusing to sustain it by the means essential to its preservation and comfort.

God made but one man out of the earth, and one earthly *nature* of every sort, by a positive, direct, and immediate agency, of wisdom, power, and goodness. He gave these the power, according to his own constitution or *system* of nature, of reproducing and multiplying to an indefinite extent. But still this life is transmitted, diffused, and sustained by God operating through the system of nature. So Jesus, in the new creation, by his Spirit sent down from heaven after his glorification, did, by a positive, direct, and immediate agency, create one congregation, one mystical, or spiritual body; and, according to the constitution or system of the kingdom of heaven, did give to that mystical body created in Jerusalem, out of the more ancient earthly kingdom of God, the power of reproducing and multiplying to an indefinite extent. But still this new and spiritual life is transmitted, diffused, and sustained by the Spirit of God, operating through the constitution, or system of grace, ordained in the kingdom of heaven.

Hence in setting up the kingdom of heaven, as in setting up the kingdom of nature, there was a display of divinity, compared with every thing subsequent, properly supernatural. Hence the array of apostles, prophets, extraordinary teachers, gifts, powers, miracles, &c. &c. But after this new mystical body of Christ was created and made, it had, and yet has, according to the system of grace under the present administration of the kingdom of heaven, the power of multiplying and replenishing the whole earth, *and will do it*; for as God breathed into the nostrils of Adam the spirit of life after he had raised him out of the dust; and as he bestowed on his beloved Son Jesus,

after he rose out of the water, his Holy Spirit, without measure; so on the formation of the first congregation, figuratively called *the body of Christ*, Jesus did breathe into it the Holy Spirit to animate and inhabit it till he come again. The only temple and habitation of God on earth, since Jesus pronounced desolation on that in Jerusalem, is this body of Christ.

Now this first congregation of Christ, thus filled with the Spirit of God, had the power of raising other congregations of Christ; or, what is the same thing, of causing the body of Christ to grow and increase. Thus we see that other congregations were soon raised up in Judea and Samaria by the members of the Jerusalem body. Many were begotten to God by the Spirit of God, through the members of the first congregation. And since the Spirit himself ceased to operate in all those splendid displays of supernatural grandeur, by still keeping the disciples of Christ always in remembrance of the things spoken by the holy Apostles, and by all the arguments derived from the antecedent blessings bestowed, working in them both to will and do according to the benevolence of God, he is still causing the body of Christ to grow and increase in *stature*, as well as in knowledge and the favor of God. Thus the church of Christ, inspired with his Spirit, and having the oracles and ordinances of the reign of heaven, is fully adequate to the conversion of the whole world if she prove not recreant to her Lord.

In the work of conversion, her Evangelists, or those whom she sends beyond the precincts of her weekly meetings, have, under the influence of the Spirit of God, simply to propose the constitution, or the glad tidings of the reign, to those without; and by all the arguments which the oracles of God and the times and occasions suggest, to beseech and persuade men to be reconciled to God, to kiss the Son, to accept the constitution, to bow to him who is ordained a Prince and a Saviour to grant repentance and remission of sins to all who submit to his government. Thus they, and the congregation who sends them forth and sustains them in the work, beget children to God by the gospel, and enlarge the body of Christ.

With all these documents before us, may we not say, that, as Eve was the mother of all living, so "Jerusalem is the mother of us all"? And thus, to use the language of Paul, "Men are begotten to God by the gospel" through the instrumentality of the congregations of Christ.

Under the present administration of the kingdom of heaven a great apostacy has occurred, as foretold by the Apostles. As the church, compared to a city, is called "Mount Zion," the apostate church is called "Babylon the Great." Like Babylon the type, "Mystery Babylon" the antitype, is to be destroyed by a Cyrus that knows not God. She is to fall by the sword of infidels, supported by the fierce judgments of God. "The Holy City" is still trodden under foot, and the sanctuary is filled with corruptions. It is, indeed, a den of thieves; but strong is the Lord that judges the apostate city. Till that great and notable day of the Lord come, we cannot, from the prophetic word, anticipate a universal return to the original gospel, nor a gener-

al restoration of all the institutions of the kingdom of heaven in their primitive character; and, consequently, we cannot promise to ourselves the universal subjugation of the nations to the sceptre of Jesus.

But were we to enter upon the consideration of the administration of the affairs of the kingdom after the fall and overthrow of the apostate city and the conversion of the Jews, we should have to launch upon a wide and tempestuous ocean, for which our slender bark is not at this time sufficiently equipped. This may yet deserve the construction of a large vessel in a more propitious season. Meanwhile, the original gospel is extensively proclaimed, and many thousands are preparing for the day of the Lord; and these are taught by the "Faithful and True Witness" that the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night, and that their happiness and safety alike consist in being prepared for his second advent.

Address to the Citizens of the Kingdom.

Fellow-Citizens,

Your rank and standing under the reign of the Prince of Peace have never been surpassed—indeed, have never been equalled by any portion of the human race. You have visions and revelations of God—his being and perfections—developments of the depths of his wisdom and knowledge, of the counsels of his grace, and the purposes of his love, which give you an intellectual and moral superiority above all your predecessors in the patriarchal and Jewish ages of the world. Secrets of God, which were hid from ages and generations, have been revealed to you by the Apostles of the Great Apostle and High Priest of your confession. What Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Moses, David, Isaiah, Daniel, and all the Prophets, down to John the Harbinger, rejoiced to anticipate, you have realized and enjoyed. The intellectual pleasures of the highest and most sublime conceptions of God and of Christ vouchsafed to you, so far transcend the attainments of the ancient people of God, that you are comparatively exalted to heaven, and may enjoy the days of heaven upon earth. You have a book which contains not only the charter of your privileges, but which explains a thousand mysteries in the antecedent administrations of God over all the nations of the earth. In it you have such interpretations of God's past providences in the affairs of individuals, families, and nations, as open to you a thousand sources of rational and sentimental enjoyment from incidents and things which puzzled and perplexed the most intelligent and highly favored of past ages. Mountains are, indeed, levelled; valleys are exalted; rough places are made plain, and crooked ways straight to your apprehension; and from these data you are able to form more just conceptions of the present, and more lofty anticipations of the future, than fell to the lot of the most highly favored subjects of preceding dispensations. And, indeed, so inexhaustible are the deep and rich mines of knowledge and understanding in the Christian Revelations, that the most comprehensive mind in the kingdom of heaven might labor in them during

the age of a Methusaleh, constantly enriching itself with all knowledge and spiritual understanding, and yet leave at last vast regions and tracts of thought wholly unexplored.

But this decided superiority over the most gifted saints of former ages you unquestionably enjoy. Among all the living excellencies with which they were acquainted, they wanted a perfect model of all human excellence. Bright as were the virtues and excellencies of an Abraham, a Joseph, a David, there were dark spots, or, at least, some blemishes in their moral character. They failed to place in living form before their contemporaries, or to leave as a legacy to posterity, every virtue, grace, and excellence that adorn human nature. But you have Jesus not only as "the image of the invisible God," "an effulgence of his glory and an exact representation of his character," but as a man holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sin, exhibiting in the fullest perfection every excellence which gives amiability, dignity, and glory to human character. You have motives to purity and holiness, a stimulus to all that is manly, good, and excellent, from what he said, and did, and suffered as the Son of Man, which would have added new charms and beauties to the most exemplary of all the saints of the olden times.

Means and opportunities of the highest intellectual and moral enjoyments are richly bestowed on you, for which they sighed in vain; God having provided some better things for Christians than for Jews and patriarchs. Shall we not, then, fellow-citizens, appreciate and use, as we ought, to our present purity and happiness, to our eternal honor and glory, the light which the Sun of Righteousness has shed so richly and abundantly on us? Remember that we stand upon Apostles and Prophets, and are sustained by Jesus the light of the world, and the interpreter and vindicator of all God's ways to man, in cre ation, providence, and redemption. All suns are stars: and he that is now to us in this life "*the Sun of Righteousness*," in respect of the future is "*the bright and Morning Star*." Till the day of eternity dawn, and the day star of immortality arise in our hearts, let us always look to Jesus.

But it is not only the felicity of superior heavenly light, though that is most delectable to our rational nature, which distinguishes you the citizens of this kingdom; but that personal, real, and plenary remission of all sin, which you enjoy through the blood of the Lamb of God, bestowed on you through the ordinances of Christian immersion and confession of sins.

The Jews, indeed, had sacrifices under the law, which could, and did take away ceremonial sins: and which so far absolved from the guilt of transgressing that law, as to give them a right to the continued enjoyment of the temporal and political promises of the national compact; but farther Jewish sacrifices and ablutions could not reach. This benefit every Jew had from them.—But as respected the conscience, Paul, that great commentator on Jewish sacrifice, assures us they had no power. "With respect to the conscience," says he, "they could not make him who did the service perfect."

The entrance of the law gave the knowledge of sin. It gave names to particular sins, and "caused the offence to abound." The sacrifices appended to it had respect to that institution alone, and not to sin in the general, nor to sin in its true and proper nature. The promise made to the patriarchs and the sacrificial institution added to it, through faith in that promise, led the believing to anticipate a real sin-offering; but it appears the Jewish sacrifices had only respect to the Jewish institution, and excepting their typical character, gave no new light to those under that economy, on the subject of a true and *proper* remission of sins, through the real and bloody sacrifice of Christ.

The patriarch and the believing Jew, as respected a real remission of sins, stood upon the same ground; for, as has been observed, the episode institution, or, as Paul says, "the supervening of the law," made no change in the apprehensions of remission as respected the conscience. But a new age having come, (for "these ordinances for cleansing the flesh were imposed only till the time of reformation,") and Christ having, by a more perfect sacrifice, opened the way into the true holy places, has laid the foundation for perfecting the conscience by a real and full remission of sins, which, by the virtue of his blood, terminates not upon the flesh, but upon the conscience of the sinner.

John, indeed, who lived at the dawn of the Reformation, preached reformation with an immersion for the remission of sins; saying that 'they should believe in him that was to come after him.' Those who believed John's gospel and reformed, and were immersed into John's reformation, had the remission of sins through faith in him that was to come: but you, fellow-citizens, even in respect of the enjoyment of remission, are greatly advanced above the disciples of John. You have been immersed, not only by the authority of Jesus, *as Lord of all*, into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, but *into the death* or sacrifice of Christ. This no disciple of Moses or of John knew any thing about. This gives you an insight into sin, and a freedom from it, *as respects the conscience*—a peace and a joy unutterable and full of glory, to which both the disciples of Moses and of the Harbinger were strangers. So that the light of the risen day of heaven's eternal Sun greatly excells, not only the glimmerings of the stars in the patriarchal age, and the faint light of the moon in the Jewish age, but even the twilight of the morning.

Your new relation to the Father, to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit, into which you have been introduced by faith in the Messiah and immersion into his death, verifies, in respect of the sense and assurance of remission, all that John and Jesus said concerning that superiority of privilege vouchsafed under the Messiah in the kingdom of heaven. You can see your sins washed away in the blood that was shed on Mount Calvary. That which neither the highly favored John nor any disciple of the Messiah could understand, till Jesus said "*It is finished*," you not only clearly perceive, but have cordially embraced. You can feel, and say with all assurance, that "the blood of Jesus Christ now cleanses you from all sin;" and that by faith you have

access to the Mediator of the New Institution, and to the blood of sprinkling which speaks glad tidings to the heart. You have an Advocate with the Father, and, when conscious of any impurity, coming to him by God, confessing your sins, and supplicating pardon through his blood, you have the promise of remission. You now know how God is *just* as well as merciful in forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin.

But superior light and knowledge, and enlarged conceptions of God, with such an assurance of real and personal remission as pacifies the conscience and introduces the peace of God into the heart, are not the only distinguishing favors which you enjoy in the new relation to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, into which you are introduced under the Reign of Heaven; but you are formally *adopted into the family of God*, and constituted the sons and daughters of the Father Almighty.

To be called "*the friend of God*" was the highest title bestowed on Abraham; to be called the friends of Christ, was the peculiar honor of the disciples of Christ, to whom he confided the secrets of his reign; but to be called "the children of God through faith in Jesus Christ," is not only the common honor of all Christians, but the highest honor which could be vouchsafed to the inhabitants of this earth. Such honor have you, my fellow-citizens, in being related to the only begotten Son of God: "For to as many as received him he gave the privilege of becoming the sons of God." These, indeed, were not descended from families of noble blood, nor genealogies of high renown; neither are they the offspring of the instincts of the flesh, nor made the sons of God "by the will of man," who sometimes adopts the child of another as his own; but they are "born of God" through the ordinances of his grace. "Behold how great love the Father has bestowed on us that we should be called children of God!" "The world, indeed, does not know us, because it did not know him. Beloved, now are we the children of God. It does not yet appear what we shall be!"

"Because you are sons, God has sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." And if sons, it follows "you are heirs of God through Christ" the Heir of all things. Is this, fellow-citizens, a romantic vision, or sober and solemn truth, that you are children of God, possessing the spirit of Christ, and constituted heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ of the eternal inheritance! What manner of persons, then ought you to be! How pure, how holy, and heavenly in your temper; how just and righteous in all your ways; how humble and devoted to the Lord; how joyful and triumphant in your King!

Permit me, then, to ask, Wherein do you excell?—nay, rather, you will propose this question to yourselves. You will say, How shall we still more successfully promote the interest, the honor, and the triumphs of the gospel of the kingdom? Is there any thing we can do by our behaviour, our morality, our piety, by our influence, by all the earthly means with which God has furnished us? Is there any thing we can do more to strengthen the army of the faith, to invigorate

the champions of the kingdom, to make new conquests for our King? Can we not increase the joy of the Lord in converting souls—can we not furnish occasions of rejoicing to the angels of God—can we not gladden the hearts of thousands who have never tasted the joys of the children of God?

In the present administration of the kingdom of God, during the absence of the King he has said to the citizens, "Put on the armor of light"—"Contend earnestly for the faith"—"Convert the world"—"Occupy till I come"—"Let your light shine before men, that they, seeing your good works, may glorify your Father in heaven"—"That the Gentiles may, by your good works, which they shall behold, glorify God in the day of visitation." He has thus entrusted to the citizens the great work for which he died—the salvation of men. Let us, then, brethren, be found faithful to the Lord and to men, that he may address us at his coming with the most acceptable plaudit, "Well done, good and faithful servants; enter into the joy of your Lord!"

Great as the opposition is to truth and salvation, we have no reason to despond. Greater are our friends and allies, and infinitely more powerful than all our enemies. God is on our side—Jesus Christ is our King—the Holy Spirit is at his disposal—angels are his ministering servants—the prayers of all the prophets, apostles, saints, and martyrs are for our success—our brethren are numerous and strong—they have the Sword of the Spirit, the shield of faith, the helmet of salvation, the breastplate of righteousness, the artillery of truth—the arguments of God, the preparation of the gospel of peace—our Commander and Captain is the most successful General that ever entered the field of war—he never lost a battle—he is wonderful in counsel, excellent in working, valiant in fight—the Lord of *hosts* is his name. He can stultify all the machinations of our enemies, control all the powers of nature, and subdue all our foes, terrestrial and infernal. Under his conduct we are like Mount Zion that can never be moved. Indeed, under him we are come to Mount Zion, the strong hold and fortress of the kingdom, the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem—to myriads of angels—the general assembly and congregation of the first born, enrolled in heaven—to God the Judge of all—to the spirits of just men made perfect—to Jesus the Mediator of the New Constitution—and to the blood of sprinkling, which speaks such peace, and joy, and courage to the heart. Ought we not, then, brethren, "to be strong in the Lord and in the power of his might"? If in faith, and courage, and prayer, we put on the heavenly armor, and march under the King, sounding the gospel trumpet, the walls of Jercho will fall to the ground, and the banners of the Cross will wave over the ruins of Paganism, Atheism, Scepticism, and Sectarianism—

Nil desperandum, te duce Christe.

If a Roman could say, 'Nothing is to be feared under the auspices of Cesar,' may not the Christian say, There is no despair under the guardianship of Messiah the King?

But, fellow-citizens, though clothed with the whole panoply of heaven, and headed by the Captain of Salvation, there is no success in this war to be expected without constant and incessant prayer. When the Apostles began to build up this kingdom, notwithstanding all the gifts they enjoyed, they found it necessary to devote themselves to prayer as well as to the ministry of the word. And when Paul describes all the armor of God, piece by piece, in putting it on, he says, "Take the Sword of the Spirit—with all supplication and deprecation, pray at all seasons in spirit, watch with all perseverance and supplication for all the saints."

This was most impressively and beautifully pictured out in the wars of ancient Israel against their enemies. While Moses lifted up his holy hands to heaven, Israel prevailed; and when he did not, Amalek prevailed. So is it now. When the disciples of Christ, the heaven-born citizens of the kingdom, continue instant in prayer and watchfulness, the truth triumphs in their hearts and in the world. When they do not, they become cold, timid, and impotent as Samson shorn, and the enemy gains strength over them. Then the good cause of the Lord languishes.

It is not necessary that we should understand how prayer increases our zeal, our wisdom, our strength, our joy, or how it gives success to the cause, any more than that we should understand how our food is converted into flesh, and blood, and bones. It is only necessary that we eat; and it is only necessary that we should pray as we are taught and commanded. Experience proves that the outward man is renewed day by day by our daily bread; and experience proves that the inward man is renewed day by day by prayer and thanksgiving. The Lord has promised his Holy Spirit to them that ask him in truth; and is it not necessary to their success? If it be not necessary to give new revelations, it is necessary to keep in mind those already given, and to bring the word written seasonably to our remembrance. Besides, if the Spirit of the Lord was necessary to the success of Gideon and Barak, and Samson and David, and all the great warriors of Israel according to the flesh, who fought the battles of the Lord with the sword, the sling, and the bow; who can say that it is not necessary to those who draw the Sword of the Spirit and fight the good fight of faith? In my judgment it is as necessary now as then: necessary I mean to equal success—necessary to the success of those who labor in the word and teaching Jesus Christ—and necessary to those who would acquit themselves like men in every department in the ranks of the great army of the Lord of hosts.

Though the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but spiritual, they are mighty, (only, however, *through God*, to the overturning of strong holds.) to the overturning of all reasonings against the truth, and every high thing raised up against the knowledge of God, and in leading captive every thought to the obedience of Christ. Let us, then, fellow-citizens, whether as leaders or as private soldiers, abound in prayer and supplications to God night and day. If sincere, and ardent, and incessant prayers to God for every thing that he has pro-

mised; for all things for which the Apostles prayed were offered up by all the congregations, and by every disciple in his family and in his closet for the triumphs of the truth, then would we see the army of the Lord successful in fight against atheism, infidelity, and sectarianism—then would we see disciples growing in knowledge and in favor with God and man. And is not the conversion of the world, and our own eternal salvation, infinitely worthy of all the effort and enterprize in man, seeing God himself has done so much in the gift of his Son and Holy Spirit, and left for us so little to do—nothing, indeed, but what is in the compass of our power? And shall we withhold that little, especially as he has given us so many and so exceedingly great and precious promises to stimulate us to exertion? Has not Jesus said, "The conqueror shall inherit all things"?—that he "will not blot his name out of the book of life"?—that he will confess it before his Father and his holy angels?—that he will place him upon his throne, and give him the crown of life that shall never fade away"?

Rise up, then, in the strength of Judah's Lion! Be valiant for the truth! Adorn yourselves with all the graces of the Spirit of God! Put on the armor of light; and, with all the gentleness, and meekness, and mildness there is in Christ—with all the courage and patience, and zeal, and effort worthy of a cause so salutary, so pure, so holy, and so divine, determine never to faint nor to falter till you enter the pearly gates—never to lay down your arms, till, with the triumphant millions, you stand before the throne, and exulting sing, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and might, and honor, and glory, and blessing!"—"To him who sits upon the throne and to the Lamb be blessing, and honor, and glory, and strength forever and forever!" Amen.

A Word to friendly Aliens.

Whether to regard you in the light of *Proselytes of the Gate*, who refused circumcision, but wished to live in the land of Israel, to be in the suburbs of the cities of Judah, and to keep some of the institutions of the ancient kingdom of God, without becoming fellow-citizens of that kingdom; or whether to regard you as the Samaritans of old, who built for themselves a temple of God upon Mount Gerizim, held fast a part of the ancient revelation of God, and rejected only such parts of it as did not suit their prejudices—worshipped the God of Israel in common with the idols of the nations from which they sprang—I say, whether to regard you in the light of the one or the other of those ancient professors of religion, might require more skill in casuistry than we possess—more leisure than we have at our disposal—and more labor than either of us have patience to endure. One thing, however, is obvious, that if under the Reign of Heaven it behoved so good a man as Cornelius ("a man of piety, and one that feared God with all his house, giving also much alms to the people, and praying to God continually,") to "*hear words by which he might*

be saved," and to put on Christ by immersion into his death, that he might enter the kingdom of heaven, and enjoy the remission of sins and the hope of an inheritance among all the sanctified—certainly it is both expedient and necessary that you also go and do likewise.

Every sectarian in the land, how honest and pious soever, ought to bury his sectarianism and all his other sins of omission and commission in "the bath of regeneration." It is a high crime and misdemeanor in any man, professing to have received the Messiah in his proper person, character, and office, to refuse allegiance to him in any thing; and to substitute human inventions and traditions in lieu of the ordinances and statutes of Prince Immanuel. Indeed, the keeping up of any dogma, practice, or custom, which directly or indirectly supplants the constitution, laws, and usages of the kingdom over which Jesus presides, is directly opposed to his government, and would ultimate in dethroning him in favor of a rival, and in placing upon his throne the author of that dogma, practice, or usage which supplants the institution of the Saviour of the world.

It is to you, then, who, in the name of the King, are changing his ordinances and substituting your own expedients for the wisdom and authority of the Judge of all, we now propose the following considerations.

Every kingdom has one uniform law or institution for naturalizing aliens; and that institution, of whatever sort it be, is obligatory by the authority of the government upon every one who would become a citizen. We say it is obligatory upon him who desires to be a citizen to submit himself to that institution. But does not your practice and your dogma positively say, that it is not the duty of an alien to be born again, but that it is the duty of his father or guardian to have him naturalized? Now, although many things are in common the duty of brother, father, and child, yet those duties which belong specifically to a father cannot belong to his child, either in religion, morality, or society. If it be the father's duty to "offer his child to the Lord," to speak in your own style, it is not the duty of the child to offer himself. It was not Isaac's duty to be circumcised, but Abraham's duty to circumcise him. If, then, it was your father's duty to have made you citizens of the kingdom of heaven, it is not your duty to become citizens, unless you can produce a law, saying, that in *all cases* where the father fails to do his duty, then it shall be the duty of the child to do that which his father neglected.

Again—if all fathers, like yours, had, upon their own responsibility, without any command from the Lord, baptized their children, there would not be one in a nation to whom it could be said, "Repent and be baptized"—much less could it be said to every penitent, "Be baptized, every one of you, by the authority of the Lord, for the remission of sins." These remarks are only intended to show that your institutions do, in truth, go to the subversion of the government of Christ, and to the entire abolition of the institutions of his kingdom. On this account alone, if for no other reason, you ought to be constitutionally naturalized, and be legally and honorably inducted into the

kingdom of heaven. It is a solemn duty you owe the King and his government; and if you have a conscience formed by the Oracles of God, you can have no confidence in God, nor real peace of mind, so long as you give your support—your countenance, example, and entire influence to break down the institutions of Jesus Christ, to open his kingdom to all that is born of the flesh, and to prevent as far as you can every man from the pleasure of choosing whom he shall obey—of confessing him before men—of taking on his yoke—of dying, being buried, and raised with Christ in his gracious institution. If Jesus himself, for the sake of fulfilling all righteousness, or of honoring every divine institution, though he needed not the reformation nor the remission which John preached, was immersed by John—what have you to say for yourselves—you who would claim the honors and privileges of the kingdom of heaven, refusing to follow the example of Jesus, and who virtually subvert his authority by supporting a system which would, if carried out, not allow a voluntary agent in all the race of Adam to do that which all the first converts to Christ did by authority of the commission which Jesus gave to all his Apostles?

Again—whatever confidence you may now possess that you are good citizens of the kingdom of the Messiah, that confidence is not founded upon a "THUS SAITH THE LORD," but upon your own reasonings, which all men must acknowledge may be in this, as in many other things, fallacious. Jesus has said, "He that believes and is immersed shall be saved;" and Peter commanded every penitent to be immersed for the remission of his sins. Now he who hears the word, believes it, and is on his own confession immersed, has an assurance, a confidence, which it is impossible for you to have.

Let me add only another consideration, for we are not now arguing the merits of your theory, or that of any party: it is your duty, as you desire the union of (what you call) the church, and the conversion of the world, forthwith to be immersed and be born constitutionally into the kingdom; because all Protestants, of every name, if sincere believers in Jesus *as the Christ*, irrespective of every opinion found in any human creed, could, if they would, honor and obey his institutions, come into one fold, and sit down together under the reign of the Messiah. If all would follow your example this would necessarily follow; if they do not, you have done your duty. In being thus immersed, all the world, Catholic and Protestant, admit that you are truly and scripturally baptized; for all admit that an *immersed penitent* is constitutionally baptized into Christ: but only a part of the professing world can admit that rite of infant affusion on which you rely, as introducing you, without previous knowledge, faith, or repentance, into the family of God. Acquit, then, your conscience; follow the example of Jesus; honor and support his authority; promote the union and peace of the family of God; do what in you lies for the conversion of the world; enter into the full enjoyment of the blessings of the kingdom of heaven by confessing the ancient faith, and by being immersed in the name of Jesus, into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, for the remission of

sins. Then you may say as Jesus said to the Samaritan woman, Although the Samaritans have a temple on Mount Gerizim, a priesthood, and the five books of Moses, "salvation is of the Jews." Although the sects have the Oracles of God, human creeds, many altars, priests, and religious usages, *the enjoyment of salvation* is among them who simply believe what the Apostles wrote concerning Jesus, and who, from the heart, obey that mould of doctrine which the Apostles delivered to us.

In so doing you will, moreover, most wisely consult your own safety and security from the signal calamities that are every day accumulating, and soon to fall with overwhelming violence on a distracted, divided, alienated, and adulterous generation. If you are "*the people of God*," as you profess, and as we would fain imagine, then you are commanded by a voice from heaven, "Come out of her, *my people*, that you partake not of the sins of mystic Babylon, and that you receive not a portion of her plagues." (1.) If affliction, and shame, and poverty, and reproach were to be the inalienable lot of the most approved servants of God, it is better, infinitely better for you to suffer with them, than to enjoy for a season all that a corrupted and apostate society can bestow on you. Remember who it is that has said, "Happy are they who keep his commandments, for they shall have a right to the tree of life, and they shall enter in through the gates into the city!"

Address to the Belligerent Aliens.

To him who, through the telescope of faith, surveys your camp, there appears not on the whole map of creation such a motley group, such a heterogeneous and wretched amalgamation of distracted spirits, as are found in actual insurrection and rebellion, in a mad and accursed alliance against the reigning Monarch of creation. In your lines are found every unclean and hateful spirit on this side the fathomless gulf, the dark and rayless receptacle of fallen and ruined intelligences, who, in endless and fruitless wailings, lament their own follies, and through an incessant night of despair anathematize themselves and their coadjutors in the perpetration of their eternal suicide. Yes, in your ranks are found all who wilfully reject the Son of God, and will not have him to reign over them; whether they are styled the decent moralist, the honest deist, sceptic, atheist, infidel, the speculating Sadducee, the boasting Pharisee, the supercilious Jew, the resentful Samaritan, or the idolatrous Gentile. All ranks and degrees of men in political society—the king and the beggar—the sage philosopher and the uneducated clown—the rich and the poor, who disdain the precepts of the Messiah, unite with you in this unholy alliance against the kingdom of heaven. You may boast of many a decent fellow-soldier in the crusade against Immanuel; many who, when weighed in the balances of the political sanctuary, are not found wanting in all the decencies of this present life; but only look

(1.) Revelation, chapter xviii. verses 4 and 5.

at the innumerable crowds of every sort of wretches, down to the filthiest, vilest matricide, who in your communion are fighting under your banners—stout-hearted rebels!—leagued with you in your attempts to dethrone the Lord's Anointed. If you boast of one Marcus Aurelius, you must fraternize with many a Nero, Domitian, Caligula, and Heliogabulus. If you rejoice in the virtues of one Seneca, you must own the vices of the ten thousand murderers, robbers, adulterers, drunkards, profane swearers, and lecherous debauchees, who have rejected the counsels of heaven, because the precepts of righteousness and life forbade their crimes.

If, then, my friends, (for I now address the most honorable of your community,) you boast that you belong to a very large and respectable synagogue, remember, I pray you, that to this same synagogue in which you have your brotherhood, belongs every thing mean, and vile, and wretched, in every land where the name of Jesus has been announced. *What a group!* Have you so much of the reflex light of the gospel falling upon your vision as to flush your cheek with the glow of shame when you look along the lines of your alliance, and survey the horrible faces, the ragged, and tattered, and squallid, and filthy wretches, *your companions in arms—members with you in the synagogue of Satan—and confederates against the Prince of Peace!* If you cannot blush at such a spectacle, you are not among them to whom I would tender the pearls of Jesus Christ.

What do you then say? "I am ashamed of such an alliance—of such a brotherhood; and therefore I have joined the Temperance Society—I belong to the Literary Club—and I carry my family regularly to church on every Sunday." And do you think, O simpleton! that these human inventions, which only divide the kingdom of Satan into casts, and form within it various private communions, honorable and dishonorable associations, learned and unlearned fraternities, moral and immoral conventicles, change the state of a single son of Adam as respects the Son of God!! Then may Whig and Tory, Masonic and Antimasonic clubs and conclaves—then may every political cabal, for the sake of elevating some demagogue, change the political relations in the state, and make and unmake American citizens according to fancy, in despite of constitution, law, and established precedents. No, sir; should there be as many parties in the state as there are days in a month, membership in any one of these affects not in the least the standing of any man as a citizen in relation to the United States, or to any foreign power. And by parity of reason, as well as by all that is written in the New Testament, should you join all the benevolent societies on the chequered map of christendom, and fraternize with every brotherhood born *after the will of man*, this would neither change nor destroy your citizenship in the kingdom of Satan—still you would be an alien from the kingdom of the Messiah—a foreigner as respects all its covenanted blessings—and, in the unbiassed judgment of the universe, you would stand enrolled amongst its enemies.

In *character* there are many degrees as respects any and every attribute which enters into its formation; but as respects *state* there are no degrees. In the nature of things it is impossible. Every man is either married or single, a brother, a master, a citizen, or he is not. Every man is either Christ's or Belial's; there is no middle power, and therefore no neutral state. Hence the King himself, when on the present theatre of war, told his companions to regard every man as his enemy who was not on his side. Amongst his professed friends they, who in works deny him, are even counted as enemies.

What a hopeless struggle is that in which you are engaged! Discomfiture, soon or late, awaits you. Have you counsel and strength to oppose the Sovereign of the Universe? Do you think you can frustrate the counsels of Infinite Wisdom and overcome Omnipotence? Your master is already a prisoner—your chief is in chains. The fire of eternal vengeance is already kindled for Satan and all his subjects. Mad in his disappointed ambition, and implacable in his hatred of him against whom he rebelled, he only seeks to gratify his own malice by involving with himself in irremediable ruin the unhappy victims of his seduction. He only seeks to desolate the dominions of God, and to ruin forever his fellow-creatures. Will you, then, serve your worst enemy and war against your best friend?

But your rebellion can effect nothing against God. His arm is too strong for the whole creation. You cannot defeat his counsels nor stay his almighty hand. The earth on which you stand trembles at his rebuke; the foundations of the hills and mountains are moved and shaken at his presence. You fight against yourselves. God's detestation of your course arises not from any apprehension that you can injure him; but because you destroy yourselves. Every triumph which your inordinate desires and passions gain over the remonstrances of reason and conscience, only precipitates you into deeper and deeper misery, matures you for perdition, and makes it essential to the good order and happiness of the universe that you should suffer an "everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power."

What, then, infatuates you, that you should choose death rather than life, and prefer destruction to salvation? "I am not sure that the gospel is true; I love my companions, and I cannot see any criminality in gratifying those passions and appetites which my Creator has planted in my constitution."

You admit there is a God your Creator, but you doubt whether the gospel is true! What an abuse of reason and evidence! Can you infer from any premises in your possession, that HE, whose creation man is, who has exhibited to the eye and ear of man so much wisdom, power, and goodness in all his grand designs already accomplished, and daily accomplishing, in the heavens and in the earth, teaching man to sustain the present life, to anticipate the future, and to provide for it, has never intelligibly addressed him on a subject of incomparably more importance—his own ultimate destiny! That God should have been at so much pains to elevate man in nature—to furnish

him with such an organization—to bestow on him reason and speech, admirably qualifying him to acquire and communicate instruction on all things necessary to his present animal enjoyments; and at the same time to have never communicated to him any thing relative to his intellectual nature—never to have addressed him on the themes which, as a rational creature, he must necessarily most of all desire to know; to have done every thing for his body and for the present, and nothing for his mind, nor for the future, is, to say the least of it, the most improbable conceit that the most romantic fancy can entertain.

That the Creator *could not* enlighten him on these topics is wholly inadmissable. That he could, and *would not*, is directly contrary to every analogy in creation—contradictory to every proof we have of his benevolence, an inexplicable exception to the whole order of his government: for he has provided objects for every sense—objects for every intellectual power—objects for every affection, honorable passion, appetite, and propensity in our constitution; but on your hypothesis he has only failed in that which is infinitely more dear to us, more consonant to our whole rational nature, and most essential to our happiness!! 'Tis most contrary to reason.

But the folly of your scepticism is still more glaring when we open the book of the gospel of salvation. In the history of Jesus you have the fulfilment of a thousand predictions, expressed by numerous prophets, for 1500 years before he was born. These recorded prophecies were in the possession of his and our most bitter enemies when he appeared, and are still extant in their hands. How can you dispose of these? All antiquity confirms the existence of Jesus of Nazareth in the times of Augustus and Tiberius Cesar. No contemporary opponent denied his miracles: they explained them away, but questioned not the wonderful works which he wrought. His character was the only perfect and unexceptionable one the world ever saw, either in print or in real life; and yet you imagine him to have been the greatest liar and most infamous impostor that ever lived. You must admit him to have been the teacher of every thing moral, and pure, and godlike—to have lived the most exemplary life—to have employed his whole life in doing good—while, to countenance your scepticism, you must imagine him to have been the greatest deceiver and most blasphemous pretender the world ever saw! Truly, you are fond of paradox!

His Apostles, too, for the sake of being accounted the offscourings of the world and the filth of all society—for the sake of poverty, contumely, stripes, imprisonment, and martyrdom, you imagine travelled over the earth teaching virtue and holiness—discountenancing every species of vice and immorality, while telling the most impudent lies, and that too about matters of palpable fact, about which no man having eyes and ears could be mistaken! How great your credulity! How weak your faith!

And to consummate the whole, you admit that in the most enlightened age, and amongst the most disputatious and discriminating population, both Jewish, Roman, and Grecian, in Jerusalem itself, the very

theatre of the crucifixion of the Chief, and in all Judea, and Samaria, and in all the great towns and cities of the whole ancient Roman Empire, Eastern and Western, these rude and uncultivated Galileans did actually succeed in persuading hundreds of thousands of persons, of all ranks, sexes, ages, and intellects, to renounce their former opinions and practices—to encounter proscription, confiscation of goods, banishment, and even death itself in numerous instances, through faith in their testimony, while every thing was fresh, and when the detection of any fiction or fraud was most easy!

Now if it were possible to place your folly in an attitude still more inexcusable, I would ask you to show what there is in the gospel that is not infinitely worthy of God to bestow, and of man to receive? And where under the canopy of the skies, in any country, language, or age of time, is there any thing that confers greater honor on man, or proposes to him any thing more worthy of his acceptance than the gospel?

Could there have been a more acceptable model proposed, after which to fashion man, than that after which he was originally created? When he was beguiled and apostatized from God, could there have been deputed a more honorable personage to effect his reconciliation to God, than his only begotten and well beloved Son? And could there even be imagined a more delectable destiny allotted to man than an immortality of bliss in the palace of this vast universe, in the presence of his Father and his God forever and forever? Now with all these premises, will you object to this religion that it requires a man to be pure and holy, in order to his enjoyment of this eternal salvation? Then lay your hand upon your face, and blush, and be ashamed forever!

But you say you love your companions! And who are they? Your fellow-rebels, foolish and infatuated as yourselves. The drunkard, the thief, the murderer, love their companions, the partners of their crimes. Conspirators and partizans in any undertaking, kindred spirits in guilty and daring enterprize, confirm each other in their evil machinations, and either from mutual interest or from some hateful affinity in evil dispositions, coalesce and league together in bands of malicious depredation. A Cataline, a Jugurtha, a Robespiere, had their confederates. The rakes, the libertines, the freebooters of every color, form their own fraternities and have a liking of some sort for their companions. And wherein does your attachment to your companions differ from theirs? A congeniality of disposition, a similarity of likings and dislikings, all springing from your love of the world and your dislike of the authority of the Messiah. And will not a change of circumstances convert your affection into hatred? Soon or late, if you do not repent and turn to God, you that are leagued in the friendships of the world, those friendships arising from the lusts of the flesh, the lusts of the eye, and the pride of life, will not only become enemies, but mutual tormentors of one another. Your warmest friends in your opposition to the Son of God will become King's evidence against you, and exasperate the flame that will consume you forever and ever. Break off, then, every friendship, alliance, and

covenant which you have formed with them that disdain the grace of God and contemn the Saviour of the world, and form an everlasting covenant with the people of God, which shall never be forgotten. Then, indeed, you may love your companions with all the affection of your hearts, and indulge to the utmost every sympathy and social feeling of your nature. Then may you embrace, in all the ardor of fraternal love, those kindred spirits that with you have vowed eternal allegiance to the gracious and rightful Sovereign of all the nations of the redeemed in heaven and on earth. Such companions are worth possessing, and their friendship worth cultivating and preserving through all the journey of life; for it will be renewed beyond the Jordan, and flourish with increasing delight through the countless ages of eternity.

But you have said that the gratification of all the impulses and propensities of your nature must be innocent, because they are the creation of God, and were sown in the embryo of your physical constitution. If under the control of that light and reason under which God commanded your affections and appetites to move, your reasoning would be sound and safe; but if they have usurped a tyranny over your judgment and captivated your reason, they are not to be gratified. They are like successful rebels that have dethroned their sovereign; and, because by violence and fraud in possession of the throne, they plead a divine right to wield the sceptre over their dethroned Prince. Such is the meaning of the plea which you urge in favor of your rebellious affections. When man rebelled against his Creator, the beasts of the field, till then under his dominion, rebelled against him; and all his passions, affections, and propensities partook of the general disorder—of that wild and licentious anarchy which ensued upon man's disobedience. And have you not in your daily observation—nay, have you not in your own experience, irrefragable evidence that the uncontrolled indulgence of even the instinctive appetites, as well as the gratification of inordinate passions and affections, necessarily issue in the destruction of the physical constitution of man. Is not the control of reason, is not the exercise of discretion in the licence of every animal indulgence essential to the health and life of man? Then why crave an exemption from the universal law of human existence, in favor of that demoralizing course of indulgence which you would fain call innocent in morals, though in physics evidently destructive to animal organization?

When reconciled to God through the gospel, the peace of God which passes understanding reigning in the heart, all is order and harmony within. Then, under the control of enlightened and sanctified reason, all the passions, appetites, and instincts of our nature, like the planets round the sun, move in their respective orbits in the most perfect good order, preserving a perfect balance in all the principles and powers of human action. Pleasures without alloy are then felt and enjoyed from a thousand sources, from which, in the tumult and disorder of rebellion, every transgressor is debarred. It is then found that there is not a supernumerary passion, affection, nor appetite in man—not one that adds not something to his enjoyment—not one that may not

be made an instrument of righteousness, a means of doing good to others, as well as of enjoying good yourselves. Why not, then, lay down the weapons of your rebellion, and be at peace with God, with your fellow-creatures, and with yourselves?

"Admitting, then, that the gospel is true—that in my present state and standing I am an alien from the kingdom of heaven, and that I wished to become a citizen, where shall I find this kingdom of heaven, and how shall I be constituted a citizen thereof?" Well, indeed, may you admit the gospel to be true, both on account of what it is in itself, and the evidence which sustains it. Only suppose it to be false—extinguish all the light which it sheds on the human race—make void all its promises—annul all its hopes—eradicate from the human breast all the motives which it imparts; and what remains to explain the universe, to develope the moral character of God, to dissipate the gloom which envelopes in eternal night the destiny of man, to solace and cheer him during the incessant struggle of life, to soothe the bed of affliction and death, and to countervail that inward dread and horror of falling into nothing—of being forever lost in the promiscuous wreck of nature—of sinking down into the grave, the food of worms, the prey of an eternal death?

It is like annihilating the sun in the heavens. An eternal night ensues. There is no beauty, form, nor comeliness in creation. The universe is in ruins. The world without the Bible is a universe without a sun. The Atheist is but an atom of matter in motion, belonging to no system, amenable to none, without a destiny, without an object to live or to die. He boasts there is none to punish him: but then there is none to help him—none to reward him. He has no Father, proprietor, or ruler—no filial affection, no sense of obligation, no gratitude, no comfort in reflection, no joy in anticipation. If he cannot be blamed, he cannot be praised—if he cannot be praised, he cannot be honored—and man without honor is more wretched than the beasts that perish. Unenviable mortal!

What an abortion is the system of nature, if man lives not again! 'Tis a creation for the sake of destruction. 'Tis an infinite series of designs, ending in nothing. 'Tis a universe of blanks, without a single prize. It cannot be. The Bible is necessary to the interpretation of nature. It is the only comment on nature—on providence—on man. Man without it, and without the hope of immortality, has nothing to rouse him into action. He is a savage, a Hottentot, a cannibal, a worm. You are compelled, then, to admit that the gospel is true, unless you put out the eye of Reason, and refuse to hear the voice of Nature.

But is it not a happy necessity which compels your belief in God, and in his Son the renovator of the Universe? It opens to you all the mysteries of creation, the arcana of the temple of nature, and inducts you to the fountain of being and of bliss. It inspires you with motives of high and lofty enterprize, stimulates you to manly action, and points out a prize worthy of the best efforts of body, soul, and spirit. Is it not, then, 'a credible saying, and worthy of universal acceptance, that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners, even the chief'?

But you ask, 'Where shall the kingdom of heaven be found, and how may you be constituted a citizen of it?' The Prophets and the Apostles must be your guide in deciding these great questions. Moses in the law, all the Prophets, and all the Apostles point you to the Lamb of God that takes away the sin of the world—the Apostle of the Father Almighty—the divinely constituted Chief of the kingdom of heaven. He has submitted his claims to your examination—he has invited you to test all his pretensions—and to the humble and docile he has tendered all necessary assistance in deciding upon his person and mission.

His character is so familiar, so condescending, so full of all grace and goodness, that all may approach him. The halt, the maimed, the deaf, the dumb, the blind, found in him a friend and physician indeed. None importunes his aid in vain. His ears are always open to the tale of woe. His eye streams with sympathy on every object of distress. He invites all the wretched, and repulses none who implore relief. He chides only the proud, and kindly receives and blesses the humble. He invites and beseeches the weary, the heavy laden, the broken hearted, the oppressed, and all the sons of want and misfortune to come to him, and tenders relief to all.

In his official dignity he presides over the universe. He is the High Priest of God and the Prophet and Messenger of Peace. He has the key of David; he opens and shuts the Paradise of God. He is the only Potentate, and has the power of granting remission of all sins to all who obey him.

To receive him in his personal glory and official dignity and supremacy, as the Messiah of God, the only begotten of the Father—to know him in his true and proper character, is the only prerequisite to the obedience of faith. He that thus accredits him is not far from the kingdom of heaven.

To assume him as your Prophet, your High Priest, and your King; to submit to him in these relations, being immersed into his death, will translate you into the kingdom of heaven. Why not, then, gladly and immediately yield him the admiration of your understanding and the homage of your heart? Why not now enter into the possession of all the riches, and fulness, and excellence of the kingdom? He commands *all* men to repent—he beseeches every sinner whom he addresses in his word to receive pardon and eternal life as a gracious gift.

Can you doubt his power to save, to instruct, and to sanctify you for heaven? Can you doubt his condescending mercy and compassion? Will not he that pitied the blind Bartimeus, that condoled with the widow of Nain, that wept with Mary and Martha at the grave of Lazarus, that heard the plea of the Syrophenician woman, that cleansed the supplicating leper, that compassionated the famishing multitudes, and looked with pity (even in the agonies of the cross) upon an importuning thief, have pity upon you and every returning prodigal who sues for mercy at the gate of his kingdom?

Is there in the universe one whom you can believe with more assurance than the Faithful and True Witness, who, in the presence of

Pontius Pilate, witnessed a good confession at the hazard of his life? Is there any person in heaven, on earth, or under the earth, more worthy of your confidence than the sinner's friend—than he who always, and in all circumstances, bore testimony to the truth? When did he ever violate his word, or suffer his promise to fail? Who ever repented of his confidence in Jesus, or of relying implicitly upon his word? Who ever was put to shame because of confidence in him?

Who can offer such inducements to obedience to his authority as the Saviour of the world? Who has such power to bless? He has all authority in heaven and on earth. He has power to forgive sins, to raise the dead, to bestow immortality and eternal life, and to judge the living and the dead. And has he not tendered all his official authority to every one who submits to his government, and who by him is reconciled to God? If he have wisdom and power divine, has he not pledged these to the relief, guidance, and benefit of his people? Who can injure them under his protection—condemn whom he justifies—criminate whom he pardons—or snatch out of his hands those who betake themselves to his mercy?

Was there ever love like his love—compassion like his compassion—or condescension like his condescension! Who ever could—who ever did humble himself like the Son of God? On whose cheek ever flowed tears of purer sympathy for human woe, than those he shed? Whose bowels ever moved with such compassion as that which dissolved his heart in tender mercies for the afflicted sons and daughters of men? Who ever for his friends endured such contradiction of sinners against himself; submitted to such indignities; sustained such accumulated sorrows and griefs; suffered such agonies of mind and body, as those which he endured in giving his life an offering for his enemies? Forsaken by his God, abandoned by all his friends, deserted of every stay, surrounded by the fiercest enemies, the most implacable foes, whose hearts were harder than adamant, insulting the very pangs which they inflicted, he expired upon the accursed tree! The heavens blushed at the sight—the sun covered his face—the earth trembled—the rocks split—the veil of the temple was rent from top to bottom—and graves opened. All nature stood horror-stricken when Roman soldiers, instigated by blood-thirsty priests, nailed him to the cross—when the chief priests, scribes, and elders in derision said, "He saved others: cannot he save himself?" The person who perceives not, who feels not the eloquence of his love consummated in his death—the tenderness of his entreaties and expostulations, is not to be reasoned with—is not to be moved by human power. Will you not, then, honor your reason by honoring the Son of God—by giving up your understanding, your wills, your affections to the teachings of the Good Spirit—to the guidance of his love? Then, and only then, can you, will you feel yourselves safe, secure, and happy.

Need you to be reminded how much you are indebted to his long suffering patience already—to his benevolence in all the gifts and bounties of his providence vouchsafed to you? How many days and nights has he guarded, sustained, and succored you! Has he not saved you from ten thousand dangers—from the pestilence that walketh in darkness secretly, and from destruction that wasteth at noon day? Who can tell but he has lengthened out your unprofitable existence to this very hour that you might now repent of all your sins, turn to God with your whole heart, be baptized for the remission of your past transgressions, be adopted into the family of God, and yet receive an inheritance among all the sanctified. Arise, then, in the strength of Israel's God—accept salvation at his hands—enter into his kingdom, and be forever blessed. You will not, you cannot repent of such a step, of such a noble surrender of yourself while life endures, in the hour of death, in the day of judgment, nor during the endless succession of ages in eternity. *To-day*, then, hear his voice: to-morrow may be forever too late! All things are ready——Come!——Saints on earth, and angels in heanen—apostles, prophets, and martyrs will rejoice over you—and you will rejoice with them forever and forever.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Number IX.——Volume V.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Bethany, Va. September, 1834.

Mr. Waterman, as found in the Methodist Advocate.

MR. WATERMAN has written for the *Western Christian Advocate* "Strictures on Mr. Campbell's Replies," touching the charge of my uncharitableness. He has also sent me a manuscript copy of said pieces, which were written FOR the W. C. Advocate. Thus has he evaded the copy-right FOR the people. Having now no guarantee that both sides shall henceforth go the Methodist people, the reasons which induced me to write him, and which reconciled my readers to the filling of so many pages with matter not very edifying to them, no longer exist. The public will no doubt appreciate the philosophy of this mode on the part of the Methodists.

The aforesaid strictures are evidently written for Methodistic consumption, and fairly prove to every sincere believer in that creed, that I am the very paragon of uncharitableness. Mr. Waterman labors this point as if the salvation of the Methodists from the original gospel and order of things depended upon their firm belief that I am the most illiberal bigot and the most uncharitable man in the whole world. I am represented as calling them "vipers," "as bad as men can be," "the antichristian beast," and yet as having nothing to say against their bishops and clergy, only that they are *unconstitutional.* I am called the *accuser* of the Methodists. And every thing of this sort that might induce a Methodist to shut his ears and harden his heart against every thing I might say, is, with an air of ridicule (not always as fine as that of Hudibras) asserted or insinuated.

It is, indeed, with no satisfaction, but with regret, that I see my friend Waterman descend to these tricks of pusillanimity—to this artifice of error—and thus abandon the discussion of the principles of Christian faith and practice. If he could prove that I am as uncha-

ritable and uncompromising as a Jew, what has this to do with the truth or falsehood of any proposition which I have advanced or attempted to sustain? It is a war for *principles*, and not for *men*, in which I am engaged.

We shall, however, for the sake not merely of sustaining the above remarks, but for the sake of giving to our readers the whole of Mr. Waterman's defence of Mr. Wesley's people (for Mr. Waterman speaks of the Methodists as Mr. *Wesley's* people) from the imputation of being the third in descent from Mistress Babylon the Great, lay before them the following section of his Strictures *for* and *from* the Western Christian Advocate of August 22; and for the sake of experimenting on the said Western Christian Advocate, whether it will give to its readers my remarks preceding and succeeding the following extract:—

OXFORD, June 28, 1834.

Mr. A. Campbell,

Dear Sir—I NOW proceed to notice your great argument, to prove that we Methodists belong to the antichristian power described by Daniel and John. John Wesley, you say, was ordained by the Church of England, and the Church of England received her ordination from the Church of Rome; and as we have never disowned the Popish doctrine of ordination, therefore we belong to the beast. This, my dear sir, I have said is your *great* argument. How *profound!* How has the Temple of Science unfolded to you her mysteries! History, hoary chronicle, how have you laid open to the mind of my friend A. C. the dark secrets of gone-by ages! But do you, my dear sir, really think that you would be justified in your conclusion, in the judgment of the candid and intelligent reader of the Bible, if it was really a fact that the Methodists held the absurd notion about the Episcopal ordination, which is believed by the High Church of England men and the Church of Rome? Admitting it to be a monstrous error, would this be sufficient to make us vipers, as bad as men can be? You know, and so does every reader of the Bible, that the antichristian power is charged with every thing that is bad in practice, and abandoned in conduct; it is represented by God as a bloody persecuting power, and is said to be guilty of blasphemy Now, sir, do you think, or dare you say, that your sectarian brethren in America are as bad as the church was, when guilty of taking away the Scriptures from the people; when claiming infallibility, and in the most wanton and cruel manner persecuting all who would not submit to this lawless despotism? Do you think that our class meetings and conferences are as bad, as vicious as a Roman Inquisition? But what will the candid reader think of your knowledge of the opinions of the Methodists, when he is informed that Mr. Wesley, at an early period of his ministry, renounced the absurd opinion held by High Church men and Roman Catholics, in relation to the virtue of Episcopal ordination. Early in 1746, we find the following entry in his journal: "I set out for Bristol. On the road, I read over Lord King's account of the primitive church. In spite of my vehement prejudices, I was

ready to believe that this was a fair and impartial draft; but if so, it would follow that bishops and presbyters are of one order; and that originally, every Christian church, or congregation, was a church independent on all others." Again he asks: "Is Episcopal, Presbyterian, or Independent church government most agreeable to reason? The plain origin of church government appears to be this: Christ sends forth a person to preach the gospel; and some of them who hear him repent and believe in Christ; they then desire him to watch over them. Here is the origin of church government; here, then, is an independent congregation, subject to no pastor but the one." Again he asks: "But are you sure that God designed the same plan should obtain in all the churches, throughout all ages? We are not sure of it, because we do not know it is asserted in Holy Writ. If the plan were essential to a Christian church, what must become of all foreign reformed churches? It would follow that they are no part of the church of Christ; a consequence full of shocking absurdity. In what age was the divine right of episcopacy asserted in England? About the middle of Queen Elizabeth's reign. Till then all the bishops and clergy in England continually allowed and joined in the ministrations of those who were not episcopally ordained." If you will be so good as to consult Mr. Wesley's Appeals to men of reason and common sense, you will there find that he contends, that ordination by imposition of hands is not necessary to constitute a man a preacher of the gospel. Accordingly the most of the ministers in England, who belong to the Wesleyan connexion, have no ordination but a vote of the conference. On the authority of this they baptize and administer the sacrament. The Methodists ordain for order's sake, and not for the sake of *virtue*. The mode is with them of no importance. They think with John Adams, in his excellent treatise on the canon law, that the popish notion that episcopal effluvia runs out of the bishop's fingers into the minister's head, at the time of ordination, is one of the most ridiculous opinions of the dark ages of Popery and superstition. The high-toned Episcopalians have always considered the opinions of the Methodists, on the subject of ordination, one of the greatest errors—a monstrous *breach of order*. And because we claim no connexion with his *Grace* of York or Canterbury, we are denounced as schismatics; and they cannot condescend to commune with us as preachers. All the Methodist preachers are called by them laymen. A little self-important clerical brother of this stamp, was lately heard, in the presence of a Methodist preacher in your county, to say, that he "lamented that his Methodist brethren had not a scriptural ordination among them." Now I would recommend to all such brothers of the holy line, to save their sympathies for some more Christian occasion. We are cynical, and cannot receive them. To us they appear as fantastical as Sterne's tears over the dead jack.

I now and then see a new table of succession tinkered up by some ecclesiastical tinker, to prove the absurd opinion that a Christian minister must trace his pedigree up to the Apostle Peter, or he cannot administer holy things. Now if it were possible for this to be done,

would it not be well for those pious brethren first to show that it is *necessary*—that it is made essential in the Bible to ministerial character. Until this is done, nothing is done. Yet how much labor and toil has Dr. Cook, of Kentucky, a very learned tinker of modern times, undergone to prove that the Church of England derives her ordination from the Apostles. This he has not done, nor can he or any other man do it. But the Doctor should first have proved that this succession is made necessary, or his labor is lost. Before the Doctor has done this, I shall venture to prophesy that his medical brethren will have settled the question about animal life, and a thousand others of this mysterious character. Every intelligent Methodist will laugh at such tales as the Doctor's, as they do at the stories about fairies and witches. This absurd opinion about the virtue of ordination, Mr. Wesley has taught *his people* to consider a *fable*. So, my dear sir, you see that your great argument is torn all to pieces, and given to the winds. Pardon me, my dear sir, when I express my astonishment that you could make no better argument, writing in the high and romantic hills of Western Virginia; in pleasant study, far from noise and bustle; "surrounded by shrubbery that a Shenstone might have envied;" blessed with an extensive library; and, above all, stimulated by the soul-inspiring hope of being hailed by unborn millions as the restorer of the *ancient* order of things. Could you make no better argument? What a silly man I was! I thought you would have dived into the mystic numbers of Daniel and John, and have proved by labored argument and learned lore, that the true hour of reformation never had arrived until you lifted your warning voice to the slumbering church from New Bethany. Poor Philistine that I was! while I was clothing you in such learned armor, behold you come forward and slay us with a pebble stone! Permit me, dear sir, to recommend to you the propriety of studying with a little more attention the history of Methodist opinions before you attack us again.

J. A. WATERMAN.

This was a new topic in our correspondence, and we expected that if Mr. Waterman had any reasons to offer in defence of this serious and appalling imputation, as he would have his readers believe it to be, he would offer them. But, reader, judge my surprise, when on examining the whole defence, sentence by sentence, as you may now do, there is not the semblance of one argument disproving the allegation. I say again, not one! Let us examine every period in order. He states what *he* calls (not *I*) my "*great* argument." Great or small, however, let us see the refutation. Three notes of admiration close the three first periods, which will suit the three first lines of Tristram Shandy, or of any other author, just as logically as this "great argument." Next come two notes of interrogation. The last of these, which has the first word that even squints towards the "great argument," changes the question altogether; for Mr. Waterman begins in this question to open the way for proving that the grand-daughter is not the grand-mother! Did I assert that the grand-mother and the

grand-daughter represent the *same* person or character? Why, then, does Mr. Waterman begin to defend the grand-child from being identically the grand-mother! From this freak of the imagination, or this trick of my chivalrous friend, follow such interrogatories as these:—"Do you think that our class meetings and conferences are as bad, as vicious as a Roman Inquisition?" What logic!—nay, what rhetoric! Why not, Mr. Waterman, attempt to prove that your church is not figuratively the grand-daughter, rather than to prove that she is not the grand-mother! What are your notions of grand-children? Are they in nature, blood, and character, always identical with the grand-mother! If this be your theory, it is certainly not canonical. There is, according to the popular authors on genealogy, but *one-fourth* of the blood of the grand-mother in the veins of the grand-daughter; but it seems you will not allow one drop of *better* blood to flow in the veins of the grand-daughter than flows in the veins of the grand mother! I have still remaining too much respect for your good sense to even imagine that you need to be told that this single detection of your sophistry makes your whole defence supremely ridiculous.

Your second display of defence is a detail of the opinions of John Wesley on ordination. That is not the question either. This is another evasion. Mr. Wesley's opinions, you well know, are at one time of his life decidedly in favor of baptism for remission of sins, and for the weekly celebration of the supper; but are the opinions of John Wesley any evidence of the practice of "his people" in America, as you denominate them? Just as much are his opinions in 1746 of ordination. In 1784 we shall see just now what Mr. Wesley's opinions and practice were on the subject of ordination!

Truly, you place Mr. Wesley in no very enviable light before your readers, if they are acquainted with the history of Methodism *only as well as your humble servant.* You tell me if I consult "his appeals to men of reason and common sense," (and they are not very numerous it would seem,) "you will there find that he *contends* that ordination by imposition of hands is not necessary to constitute a man a preacher of the gospel." Yet it appears from the Methodist Discipline that he did, *contrary to his opinions*, lay his hands upon Dr. Coke, who already had the hands of the English clergy imposed upon him, to qualify him to come out to America as superintendent of all American Methodists. Yes, and he gave this said Dr. Coke power to lay his hands on Francis Asbury, which he did by *virtue* of "*a commission*" from the aforesaid Rev. John Wesley. Now tell me, good sir, whether the opinions or the practice of John Wesley is most to be regarded, and especially with respect to the question of *fact* found in my "great argument." When I see so strong a man as you "crouching between two burthens," be assured I sympathise with you, and will not now lay the weight of a second argument upon you.

He next gravely tells us that "the mode" of ordination is with Methodists a thing of no importance. This is another effort to change the question in my "great argument." It is not about *the mode*, but

the fact of hereditary ordination from the Mother Church about which my argument treats. And of this there is not to be found, among those who glory in the name of *Episcopal* Methodists, a single exception known to me, or presented by Mr. Waterman.

In tearing my "great argument" to pieces, the last effort of Mr. W. is as witty as his first. It is to prove that the Episcopal Church of England, the mother of Methodists, is in truth the daughter of Rome; as if to prove the mother to be the daughter was the logical *mode* of proving the child not to be the grand-daughter. He snarls at the sons of the English hierarchy for being so impudent as to boast of regular succession from the Church of Rome, and at the same time to call Methodist preachers "laymen"!

I do not recollect ever to have seen a "great argument" so ludicrously and so cruelly torn to pieces by any logical vulture, and "given to the winds," as my friend of Oxford (the Oxford of Ohio) has "killed up" my unfortunate argument, which he drew from me in the course of our correspondence. I will, however, try to gather up the pieces, and show to my readers that, notwithstanding all this cruelty and hard usage, it yet lives in good health and vigor, and that it was only the shadow of it which Mr. Waterman attacked.

As he has given me a word of advice to inform myself better on the subject of Methodistic *opinions*, I will, in return for the compliment, show him, that, however ignorant I may be of Methodistic opinions, I have formed some acquaintance with Methodistic history and *practice*. I will, then set up my "great argument" upon the pedestal of Methodistic history, so authentic that I will stipulate for Mr. Waterman he will not call the documents in question.

Narrative of the Methodistic Episcopacy.

"In 1729, two young men in England, reading the Bible, saw they could not be saved without holiness, followed after it, and incited others so to do. In 1737, they saw likewise that men are justified before they are sanctified; but still holiness was their object. God then thrust them out to raise a holy people."*—"In the year 1784 Rev. John Wesley," a presbyter of the Church of England, "sent over to America three regularly ordained clergy; but prefering the Episcopal mode of church government to any other, *he* solemnly set apart, by the imposition of *his hands*, and prayer, *one* of them, viz.—*Thomas Coke*, Doctor of Civil Law, late of Jesus College, in the University of Oxford, *a presbyter of the Church of England*, for the *episcopal office:* and having delivered to him letters of episcopal orders, *commissioned* and *directed* him to set apart Francis Asbury, then general assistant of the Methodist Society in America, for the same episcopal office; he, the said Francis Asbury, being *first ordained deacon and elder*. In consequence of which the said Francis Asbury was solemnly set apart for the said episcopal office, by prayer and the imposition of the hands of the said Thomas Coke, other re-

*John and Charles Wesley, as quoted in the Methodist Discipline, p. 3.

gularly ordained ministers assisting in the sacred ceremony. At which time the General Conference, held at Baltimore, did unanimously receive the said Thomas Coke and Francis Asbury as *their bishops*, being fully satisfied of the validity of their episcopal ordination."*

Perhaps not all the Methodists in America are as well acquainted with the following documents as with the preceding:—

Two Ministers of the Methodist order, in the year 1766, emigrated from Ireland to America—Messrs. Embury and Strawbridge; the former settled in New York, and the latter in Maryland. The next importation, in 1769, brought Richard Boardman and Joseph Pilmoor to New York. The next, in 1771, brought Francis Asbury and Richard Wright. Their doctrine spread rapidly in America. A controversy arose among the people and southern preachers with respect to the ordinances. A meeting was held in Fluvannah, Va. about 1779. At this meeting one John Dickons contended from the Bible, that presbytery, and not episcopacy, was the divine order of government in the church. The Conference were so far converted by his arguments that they formed a presbytery and ordained elders. This displeased Francis Asbury, then in the North, who, being one of the two superintendants of all American Methodists, by virtue of a commission from John Wesley, called a conference at Minakintown to consider the matter more minutely. Francis and John disputed the matter before the Conference. A separation was the result. A proposition was made by John Dickons to Francis Asbury to lay the matter before John Wesley, and that there should be a suspension of baptism and the Lord's supper until they were counselled by John Wesley. This proposition was agreed to.

John Wesley could not answer this letter till after the war ended; but as soon as peace was restored, he decided the matter in the following letter:—

"*Bristol, September* 10, 1784.

To Dr. Coke, Mr. Asbury, and our brethren in North America.

By a very uncommon train of providences, many of the provinces of North America are totally disjoined from their mother country, and erected into independent states.

The English government has no authority over them, either civil or ecclesiastical, any more than over the states of Holland.

A civil authority is exercised over them, partly by the congress, partly by the provincial assemblies. But no one either exercises or claims any ecclesiastical authority at all.

In this peculiar situation some thousands of the inhabitants of these states desire my advice; and in compliance with their desire, I have drawn up a little sketch.

Lord King's account of the primitive church convinced me many years ago, that bishops and presbyters are the same order, and consequently have the same right to ordain.

*Methodist Discipline, on the "origin of Methodism," p. 6.

For many years I have been importuned from time to time, to exercise this right, by ordaining part of our travelling preachers.

But I have still refused, not only for peace sake, but because I was determined, as little as possible, to violate the established order of the national church to which I belonged.

But the case is widely different between England and North America. Here there are bishops who have a legal jurisdiction: in America there are none, neither parish ministers.

So that for some hundred miles together there is none either to baptize or administer the Lord's supper. Here therefore my scruples are at an end:

And I conceive myself at full liberty, as I violate no order and invade no man's right, by appointing and sending laborers into the harvest.

I have accordingly appointed Dr. Coke and Mr. Francis Asbury to be joint *superintendants* over our brethren in North America, as also Richard Whatcoat and Thomas Vasey, to act as *elders* among them, by baptizing and administering the Lord's supper.

And I have prepared a liturgy, little differing from that of the Church of England, (I think, the best constituted national church in the world,) which I advise all the travelling preachers to use on the Lord's day, in all the congregations:

Reading the litany only on Wednesdays and Fridays, and praying extempore on all other days. I also advise the elders to administer the supper of the Lord on every Lord's day.

If any one will point out a more rational and scriptural way of feeding and guiding those poor sheep in the wilderness, I will gladly embrace it. At present I cannot see any better method than I have taken.

It has been proposed to desire the English bishops to ordain part of our preacheas for America. But to this I objected—1st. I desired the Bishop of London to ordain only one; but could not prevail.

2d. If they consented, we know the slowness of their proceedings; but the matter admits of no delay. 3d. If they would ordain them *now*, they would likewise expect to govern them.

And how grievously would this entangle us! 4th. As our American brethren are now totally disentangled both from the state, and from the English hierarchy, we dare not entangle them again, either with the one or the other.

They are now at full liberty simply to follow the Scriptures and the primitive church. And we judge it best that they should stand fast in that liberty wherewith God has so strangely made them free.

JOHN WESLEY."

From this letter the reader will perceive that John Wesley's first reason for not having his preachers ordained by the Bishop of London, is sufficient without the others. Had the Bishop of London only ordained one, the *Episcopal* Methodists now-a-days would have been

at par with the hierarchy of England, in America; and they would not have brooked such indignities as Mr. Waterman had to smile at in Wellsburg, Va. when a young Episcopalian presbyter treated him as a layman. But it does not appear that this was either the fault of John Wesley or of John Waterman, but of the Bishop of London, their *opinions* to the contrary notwithstanding.

But to return to the history. A general conference in Baltimore, 1784, was the first effect of the circular letter from John Wesley. *The conference unanimously agreed to separate from the Church of England*, and to become an independent community, to be thence known by the name of both father and mother, viz. "The METHODIST EPISCOPAL *Church*." Many Methodists did not like the word *Episcopal*; but Dr. Coke reconciled all parties by explaining it as "*Methodist* Episcopacy." They had *episcopacy*, but no bishop. Thomas Coke and Francis Asbury were superintendents by virtue of John Wesley's appointment, "but they were not elected by the suffrage of Conference, although it is so written in the Book of Discipline." [*See the Book of Discipline for* 1784.] In the Book of Discipline for 1784, the origin of Methodist ordination is recorded in the words following: "Our ordination is equal to that of Presbyterians, *originating* in three presbyters of the Church of England." Here we shall make a period in the history of the lineage and descent of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

It is thus we go to work when we attempt to prove a question of fact. If all the loose and unguarded sayings of my friend Waterman were worthy of as much notice as the one before us, touching my "great argument," as he would call it, were examined in this logical and prosing style, how many cubic feet of words might be compressed into the shell of an acorn! I now leave it to the reader to say, whether I have done any injustice to my Methodist friends, in affirming that they ostensibly and professedly derive their right to administer ordinances from the Church of England. Mr. Waterman agrees with me that the Church of England professedly derives her authority direct from the Church of Rome. Now if the right to administer ordinances be one of the essential characteristic attributes of the lineage of a church; and if the Church of Rome be denominated Babylon the Great, the *Mother* of Harlots—am I not sustained by evidence and fact, which no Methodist can dispute, in regarding this sect as the grand-daughter of the Mother of Harlots? I hope, however, that Mr. Waterman will never again attempt to prove that the grand-daughter and grand-mother are identical, or that the grand-daughter must always be as great a *harlot* as the grand-mother! I rejoice to know that many Methodists hate the old scarlet lady as much as some Christians that have not a drop of her blood in their veins; and, in the judgment of charity, I place my friend Waterman in the most honorable class of that community. I trust he will use his influence with the *Western Christian Advocate* to have this piece entered on its columns. I will only give another dissertation on Methodist history

to finish my demonstration, which I have no doubt will be of great use to many sincere* Methodists if they will only be permitted honestly to read it. EDITOR.

The Millennium---No. 1.

I can only say to our readers that this correspondent has a reputation for as much good sense, and biblical attainments, as any correspondent that has ever favored us with a communication for any of our periodicals. I need not say to my readers, Hear both sides; *for that I know they will do.* EDITOR.

MOUNT OLIVET, *Year of the World* 5834.

Dear Sir,

THIS is the day of searching the Bible—an ominous day. "For the divisions of Reuben there are great searchings of heart." Men are looking into the future with curious eyes and anxious souls. I too, read, the Prophets. I venerate them all. I listen to their warnings. I can say, "Happy are they who read and understand the words of prophecy." But who dares to be dogmatical on the future? Who can say, "As sure as there is truth in the Bible, this is the true meaning of prophecy." You have had, for some months past, an alarming correspondent. He has blown a long blast and a strong blast on the walls of Zion. I have been roused from my repose. I have trimmed my lamp anew. I have given him a hearing—a patient hearing. Your friend *Samuel M'Corkle* is worthy of being heard on more accounts than two; so is your friend Begg; and so was your friend Irving. They all prefer ram's horns. They think of Jericho. But, sir, in their interpretations there is not demonstration. They roll on in eccentric orbits: as do all the planets near the sun. Astronomers tell us that the small planets are more eccentric than the large ones. If Jupiter were as eccentric in its orbit as Mercury the solar system would be destroyed. Large masses of matter revolve in circular orbits—small masses, in elliptical orbits. By this means the balance of the system is perfected. Men of genius are always eccentric; and those who would be thought men of genius pretend to be eccentric. But, sir, when we spiritualize the solar system, we are admonished to regard all genii as near the sun, and as eccentric in their path as their distance from the sun and their own diameter are less than planets more remote. I belong not to the seven primary planets. I am only a *moon*, attendant on a large planet; and therefore take no honor to myself from my disavowal of eccen-

* *A Problemn for Methodists.*—You say that if a person is only sincere in his convictions, and act agreeably to them, he must be saved. Now, on this hypothesis, why send the gospel to the heathen people? It may be a savor of death to them, and can place them on no safer ground as respects salvation: for your system is that they can be saved without the knowledge of Christ as well as with it. Will you explain, then, on what principle you send out missionaries or preachers at home or abroad! Is it to make a party?

tricity. To your readers I must be nameless; for I perceive the world is governed by *names*—it must not be governed by mine. I humbly request an impartial hearing. I ask for no more. I was once a clergyman—I am not now. I am a Christian by profession. I desire no higher honor on the earth, and I aspire to none higher in heaven.

You, sir, are a man of *two sides*. Other Editors have only *one* side. As I may be regarded on the other side from our friend M'Corkle, in several very leading points in the interpretation of prophecy, I claim a hearing in your *Harbinger*. I claim it, sir, because you have two sides; and whether or not you lean to one side, as some suspect, and to M'Corkle's side, as some confidentially affirm, I expect a hearing. You have had various correspondents on that side—none on my side; and that your readers may have *both* sides, I doubt not but you will give me a hearing. This, sir, is a trait in your editorial character that will deservedly give your labors a permanency in their effect far transcending those of all your opponents.

Strike me, if you please, but hear me. When I have finished my prophecy I will hear Mr. M'Corkle, or Mr. Begg, or Mr. Editor; but let me first finish my preachment.

I presume that all your readers are acquainted with M'Corkle's views and Mr. Begg's, as you have recommended both these authors to their attention. If they have not read them, they certainly ought to read them; for on that side they are most worthy of being heard. But, sir, neither of them has, in my judgment, any well established and uniform system or rules of interpretation. They are sometimes chimerically literal, and sometimes as arbitrarily spiritual or figurative.

There is one point on which they labor without success, and in which I cannot agree with them. They labor to persuade the reader that their views ought to be sounded loud and far, because of alarming the people into reformation. If their interpretations were as certain as death, and if the literal coming of the Lord was to be expected before the present generation should die, then, indeed, I could perceive some reason for their zeal, and some sound logic in their vehemence; but as their interpretations are not as certain, and their literal advent of the Lord not so immediate, as death to all their readers, there is no philosophy to my mind in their expostulations. The Lord and his Apostles sought not to convert men by such means; and Christians can have no stronger arguments than the gospel offers, without the prophecies concerning the Millennium, to stir them up to diligence to make their calling and election sure. Notwithstanding all the glowing descriptions which they and all the poets have given of the literal reign of Messiah in Jerusalem, I would rather be in heaven than Jerusalem, in the land of Judea. After death, which, to me, at least, is more immediate than the Millennium, and much more certain than the personal and literal return of the Lord Jesus, *before* the Millennium I expect to be with the Lord if I hold on my way. Now what inducement to holiness could it be to me, or to any

one like me, who expects to be present with the Lord so soon as absent from the body, to be even assured that Jesus Christ will literally reign a thousand years in Jerusalem? I would just as soon be with the Lord where he now is, as with him there.

What I mean, sir, is simply this—that to saint and sinner there is no new argument either to turn to God or to be diligent in our calling, from this rhetorical theory of an earthly reign of a thousand years. Therefore, the Apostles and Prophets who spoke of the Millennium two thousand years ago, had as much power with men by argument as Samuel M'Corkle, a layman, clothed with all his terrors of the crash of the present dispensation, and the glories of an earthly Paradise. The hope of the resurrection of the dead and of the glories following after, was enough for Paul, and it is enough for me. To me that event is in point of time nearer than the Millennium.

These brethren, for I presume we are all brethren, though personally unknown to each other—brethren not in opinion, but in faith and in the obedience of faith, and in the hope of the coming of the Lord literally, at some day, before or after the Millennium: I say, these brethren appear to me to err in their notions of the conversion of the Jews, as much as in the moral force of their appeals to the people on the near approach of the Lord to reign on earth. According to them, the Jews are to be saved by *vision*, not by faith. They are to abide still in unbelief till the Lord come and convert them by their eyes rather than their ears. Paul said, if they abide not still in unbelief, the Lord would engraft them into their own olive tree; and that when their heart should turn to the Lord, the veil should be taken from their eyes. But these good brethren, and all the recent pleaders for a literal return, will have the veil taken off their eyes before their heart turn to the Lord—they will have the remnant of the Jews now on earth converted without faith—by sight rather than by hearing!

But, sir, I will attempt to show, without the power of rhetoric, (for I am no very flowery rhetorician,) that the Scriptures do not teach a literal coming of the Lord *before* the Millennium, nor a conversion of the Jews by *sight*, nor a literal resurrection of the saints a thousand years, or three hundred and sixty-five thousand years before the general judgment, or the resurrection and final overthrow of the wicked. But they do teach a personal and literal coming of the Lord after the Millennium and a general resurrection of all the dead at the proper coming of the Lord.

In what manner I shall attempt this I will not now stipulate. I will first offer a few strictures on our friend M'Corkle's interpretation, and attempt to show that he has studied the Apocalypse till he has become too visionary. I speak with deference, but he has taught me to speak with some degree of confidence.

But I must, to prevent misapprehensions, assure him that the ten pages of tithes and free-will offerings, out of a hundred, which he has presented to the clergy, has not in the least biassed my judgment. True, he has been profuse in such incense as the following:—"The blind guides, the false teachers of the day"—"stall-fed theologians,

those lordly pontiffs in the clerical kingdom"—"speculating priests"—"gospel merchandizers"—"did I wish to make them as corrupt as sin, I would give them what money they would demand"—"the pampered beggars receive and grow fat on the merchandize of the gospel"—"our scrapmongers and Doctors"—"peace-predicting watchmen"—"if we trace these blunders back to their source, they originate where most of our blunders do, among the priests"—"we are listening to the sing-song of the day, the lullabies of our dry, morose divines, telling us a thousand things which need not to be told, a thousand tales, fables, lies,"—"the pulpit is the fountain head of error," &c. &c. &c. This is but a single censer full of the incense which our friend offers to these blockheads, dunces, and deceivers. He seems to have forgotten that all reformers were of this very proscribed cast; that all the light and science of Europe—of the world, has come through these accursed priests. I think a little reflection would have softened a hundred periods in these hundred pages. Promiscuous slaughter is cruel and unwise. How many of these very clergymen have embraced the present reformation! A large portion of the Baptist priesthood, in all places where the *original gospel* (as you call it) has been announced, have renounced their standing among the Baptists. Has not a due proportion of the priesthood to the laity, Methodistic, Christian, and others come over to the Restoration doctrine? Did not a single act of Parliament, in Old England, make 2000 nonconformist ministers, and eject from their livings that number in one day! The clergy, I mean the Protestant clergy, as a class of men, are the best class in any community. They have their snares and temptations peculiar to themselves, and the people spoil them. Place a thousand of your best laymen in their place; and if in three years they are any better than a thousand of the present priests, then I am no prophet. They would be worse, if not as well educated: for, sir, keep me from an ignorant man in office in church or state! I quarrel with the *system* much more than with the *men*. Many of them are not Christians who aspire to the office, and the system gives them an opportunity of exerting an unhappy influence against the truth. But, sir, there were many priests of a more corrupt race than the present, who embraced the gospel in the days of the Apostles —in the days of Luther; and I have no doubt there will always be found among them many that fear God, and who will do their duty. Therefore, I must dissent from my friend M'Corkle in all the embroidery he has thrown around his interpretations, taken from the skirts of the mantles of his downy, and drowsy, and dolting priesthood. These things said, and I proceed to examine some of the positions of my lay brother.

A very strong hold, from which our brother often delights to hurl his flaming arguments at these obnoxious priests, is, that there have been three dispensations, of two thousand years each, (the third not fully expired,) and that the Millennium will be a fourth and an entirely new dispensation, as distinct from the present as the present is from the past. He discovers some strong points of analogy in these dispensations; and from these points of analogy he reasons that the

close of the third or present dispensation, and the commencement of the fourth will resemble the close of the preceding and the commencement of the present.

It is unfortunate for any cause when its pleaders begin with analogies. Analogies are the most romantic things we can imagine. A person of a teeming imagination will discover swarms of analogies every where. Some have found the whole science of Free-Masonry and the Gospel in the twelve signs of the zodiac. Then they find the twelve Patriarchs, the twelve Apostles, the twelve lions of Judah's throne, the twelve gates of the New Jerusalem, the twelve pillars of the *sanctum sanctorum* of Masonry. Analogies are good illustrations and somewhat corroborative, but they can never amount to argument. It is an injury to a good cause to begin with them; for almost all the works of romance, from the Baron Swedenborg's doctrine of correspondences, down to the "High Priest of Nature," begin and end in analogies, generally visible only to those who are near the sun. But it is still worse when the analogies themselves are incomplete; and I am not a little mistaken if this be not the case in the exordium of the layman. Let us, without rhetoric, but with all the aids of logic, examine this matter.

The Patriarchal, the Jewish, and the Christian are his three actual dispensations. The two former became corrupt—could not be reformed—therefore went into dissolution. So in the analogy will eventuate the present; and who cannot, from the same premises, infer the fortunes of the *fourth*, *fifth*, *sixth*, and *seventh* dispensations? But the two preceding dispensations lasted two thousand years, became corrupt, could not be reformed, and therefore were destroyed: so will be the present. Now let it be noticed, that if the present dispensation last only *two* thoushnd years, and because corrupt and incapable of being reformed, it should then be destroyed and a new one introduced, there would be no analogy, or, at least, not one of the analogies necessary to the layman's argument, between it and the two preceding; *for none of them lasted only two thousand years—both of them were reformed after becoming corrupt, and neither of them was destroyed simply because corrupt!* Take notice, reader!

The first, or Patriarchal dispensation, continued 2500 years, and did not go into dissolution by famine, sword, pestilence, fire, or flood, unless we imagine it to have ended in the plagues of Egypt and the drowning of Pharaoh, which I think has not been noticed by our friend M'Corkle.

2d. The Jewish dispensation lasted only 1500 years, aad was dissolved—not only because it was corrupt, but whether corrupt or not it would have been dissolved and destroyed as we do the stubble or straw when we have got the wheat: or pull down and burn up the scaffolding when the house is reared. The Son of God came out of the Jewish dispensation, as the Jewish came out of the Patriarchal, and then the kernel being extracted, the shell was thrown into the street.

3d. Before the dissolution of the two former dispensations the

people became corrupt, and were reformed by sore judgments. The flood came during the first dispensation, long before it closed, in the year of the world 1656—three and a half centuries before the first two thousand years of my good lay brother expired, and nearly nine hundred years before the second dispensation commenced. This was one sore judgment, which reformed the world for a while; and a second sore judgment, at Babel, was the confounding of language and necessary dispersion and alienation of men. Sore judgments, moreover, fell upon many cities during that dispensation—witness Sodom and Gomorrah, Admah and Zeboim.

4th. Again, many sore judgments befel the people under the second dispensation long before it closed;—famine, sword, fire, and pestilence; and did not all these judgments exert a moral influence? They were sent into captivity for *seventy years*. Their city and temple were destroyed and their land given to their enemies—only a remnant of the twelve tribes ever returned from Babylon. Now all this happened five hundred years before that dispensation closed. But were they not effectually reformed from idolatry by the captivity, and were not the reformed restored to their own land and their former privileges?

If, then, the present dispensation ends in two thousand years from its commencement—if it end, and a new one commence by sore judgments, or by a literal and personal return of the Messiah, it will be a new thing under the sun, not analogous to any antecedent dispensation. I must, however, leave my brother M'Corkle and all your readers to meditate upon this matter till you can give them another number. I do not wish to weary them at my very entrance. But tell them that I have not yet finished the analogies of the three dispensations. I have the typical character of the second to examine, and I despair not of yet satisfying the layman himself, that if the former be a type of the latter, that his argument touching dispensations is palpably delusive.

Do, Mr. Editor, apologize to your readers for the abruptness of my style, and my positive manner. Old clergymen, even when reformed, still retain a little of their didactic habits. Casks long retain the odor of the first wine which they contained; and I know that my friend M'Corkle can bear, without wincing, a healthy application of the flesh brush, judging from his athletic application of it to others. Please inform him and your readers, lest they should prejudge me, that I am decidedly a firm believer in a Millennium of one thousand years, to be preceded by the conversion of the Jews and the destruction of all the corrupt hierarchies on earth—the binding of Satan and a resurrection of the primitive church—of the great, and good, and noble spirits of former times. But this only as a hint. Let us have time and patience, and read the prophecies with prayer, fasting, and supplication.

Conceal my name till the end of the seventh volume of the Harbinger, that I may be heard without favor or affection—prejudice or partiality.

A REFORMED CLERGYMAN.

Big Meetings.

THE following judicious remarks from brother Scott, are, in my judgment and experience, worthy the attention of all those who conduct large meetings. To them I would add, that such meetings ought never to close on the Lord's day. On that day many more attend than on any preceding day. Of these some who come from unworthy motives may be wounded by the arrows of truth, and if the meeting were continued on Monday, would attend from other motives than induced their attendance on the Lord's day. Some of these wounded might be saved under proper treatment on Monday.

At all these meetings the disciples present on the Lord's day should commemorate the Lord's death in the beginning of the meeting, before sinners are addressed. For the comfortable and orderly observance of this institution, the elders of the congregation should be at pains to have the disciples sit together, and they should all know their place. In this way, without distraction, the citizens of the kingdom, with all solemnity and sacred joy, jointly participate in the memorials of Christ crucified, and renew their strength in waiting upon the Lord. When the death and resurrection of the Lord are thus, in Christian decency and order, commemorated, the aliens are addressed with effect; and by a judicious and harmonious co-operation in proclaiming the gospel, in testifying and exhorting, many may be persuaded to unite with the people of God, who are determined to keep all his commandments.

But we are not yet fully convinced that there is not a still more effectual and successful way of reforming the world and of converting sinners to God, than even these *big meetings*. For more than ten years past we have desired an opportunity of making a trial of it. Circumstances uncontrollable have hitherto prevented on our part such an experiment.

Were we doing the work of an Evangelist, our plan of operation would be as follows:—Say *two* brethren, companions in the work of converting sinners to God, determine on some field of labor—city, town, village, or district of country. They announce their intentions as soon as they arrive. Take, for example, a town of one thousand inhabitants. These two brethren, besides daily addressing such of the citizens as may meet them at any given place, visit every family in town, christian and not christian. On entering a christian family, they, in the most courteous and christian style, solicit the assistance of the heads of that family to aid them by their counsels and prayers in finding access to the hearts of sinners; and if there be in that family any one who has not obeyed the gospel, seek an interview with him, and familiarly converse with him on eternal things.—Never finally abandon an individual who will give a hearing, until the gospel is fully stated in terms every way conciliating to him, and until he positively say, "Yes, I will surrender myself to Jesus the Lord;" or, "I will not."

On entering another house, where, perhaps, there is no professor,

say, 'We have come to converse with you on the reasons why you have rejected the Messiah, or have chosen some other leader, or (as the case may be) why you are content to live and die without God and Christ and the hope of immortality.' Every thing that might be thought impertinent or intrusive, would, and ought, of course, to be cautiously avoided, both in matter and manner. And in all these visitations no other topic but Jesus and his kingdom should ever be introduced. Neither politics nor economics, nor the little circumstantials of yesterday, to day, and to-morrow, should engross a moment's attention. Nothing controversial on the theories of religion; nothing but the great facts of the gospel—their evidence, meaning, and value, and a personal application of them, should enter into the thoughts of the preacher, or be admitted as themes of conversation. Every thing should appear as in truth it is, and ought to be, the result of unfeigned sincerity and benevolence.

No doubt but such persons would often meet with repulses and mortifications, and they must be prepared to sustain them without any other feeling than that of commiseration for those who are so insensible, ignorant, or proud as to despise the Saviour, or those who are devoted to his service, and disdain the salvation, which, by his authority, is thus tendered to them.

Let us moderns say what we please about this course of procedure in laboring in the word and teaching of Christ, it is not only rational, practical, and expedient, but has in its favor the most venerable antiquity, and the sanction of the Messiah himself, as may be seen in the first mission of the Twelve and the Seventy. This preaching to families and individuals, as well as to public assemblies, if pursued with the wisdom and discretion which come from above, could not fail, in my judgment, of being eminently useful. Nothing but the result of a proper number of experiments, made by discreet, pious, and intelligent brethren, could induce a doubt of its practical utility.

It would not require many days to make a full experiment in a town of a thousand inhabitants; but unless the persons engaged in it were full of zeal, benevolence, and humanity, prudent as serpents and as harmless as doves, we could not promise ourselves much more success than usually attends the *big meetings* now in experiment. Who will give this plan of operation a fair and full trial, and report progress? ED. M. H.

From the Evangelist.

Remarks on General Meetings.

GENERAL meetings are, or may be, turned to such great account, that any observations which may enhance their value, or expedite the purposes for which they are held, will doubtless be appreciated by the brethren.

1. The first thing to be attended to by those who would hold a general meeting, would seem to be the duty of "counting the cost," or of making such provision as in justice they may deem indispensable

to defray the expences of such meeting; for no meeting of this nature can, in justice, be held at the expense of the laboring brethren, some of whom have their residence thirty, some sixty, and some a hundred miles from the place whither they have been invited to preach

2. Having, then, counted the cost, the next thing would seem to be that of selecting such of the laboring brethren as may, in the estimation of the disciples, be fitted by their gifts for the occasion.

Question—Is it desirable to have many laboring brethren present at a general meeting?

Answer—I do not think it is profitable; I do not think the presence of many laboring brethren expedites the business of a general meeting, or exalts its joys. "Too many cooks spoil the broth," says the adage; *Too many preachers spoil the meeting*, says experience.

The Apostle says, "He that teacheth should wait on teaching, or he that exhorteth on exhortation." This may have been spoken with reference to inspired gifts; but whether or no, it most certainly recognizes what is obvious among even the laborers of our times—namely, two orders of talent—the didactic, and the exhortatory; the former intended to enlighten the audience, or show them "what is;" the latter to urge them to obedience, or move them to "what ought to be;" for to show "what is" is the end of teaching, and to move to "what ought to be" (namely, obedience,) is the end of exhortation.

3. There are, then, some brethren who have the talent of teaching, and some who have the exhortatory talent; and our choice of laborers to accomplish the business of a general meeting should be made with due deference to this distinction which subsists among them in reference to gifts. Those whom we select should not all be teachers, neither should they all be exhorters; but some should be exhorters and some teachers; and the Apostle's rule should obtain, that he who teaches should wait on teaching, and he that exhorteth on exhortation.

But again, the teachers themselves differ from each other in their abilities or powers to teach. Some there be, who, under Christ, announce the name of the Lord for salvation with great power and glory, while others possess this didactic gift in a very inferior degree. The same difference obtains among the exhorting men; of whom some, in a manner that baffles description, hurry the audience through a flood of simple, or mixed feeling, to the immediate performance of duty, and, like the winnowing shovel, whose office it is to separate the grain which has already been threshed out, bring forth from the midst of the people, those whom the teaching had previously enlightened on the great matters of faith and obedience. The gift of exhortation, as I view it, is one of great power and variety, and includes not only exhortation, strictly so called, but reasoning also, and remonstrance, and reproof, and comfort, and correction, and every thing else necessary to move those who have been enlightened, to the obedience of the faith.

Still the gift is subsequent and secondary to that of teaching, without which it could do nothing, and some possess it in but a very limited degree.

One, or, at most, two teachers, then, are all that are necessary to the purposes of a general meeting; and I think they should labor time about. But I would prefer a single teacher of adequate powers, were I going to make a general meeting; for it is perfectly possible for even two to be in the way of each other. They may present to the audience two distinct points in the gospel, so wide apart that the people shall fail to see the connexion; their manner of teaching and declaring the gospel may also be so wholly different as to subserve each other but very little.

But now take a single individual with powers adequate to an orderly development of the gospel, and let him know what is expected—that he is to perform the teaching part in the general assembly, and that all the exhorters will labor to subserve his views and proclamation; and then the stone is taken off the well's mouth, and if there be living waters in the man they will flow out of him without the least doubt. But half a dozen teachers, or, as they are generally called, preachers, at the same meeting, are only in the way of each other.

As for exhorters, the more the better, if they will but hold themselves in readiness *to open mouth;* such should remember too, that if their exhortations are good, they become doubly so by being short.

The laborers should not be in haste to get away from the general meeting to which they have been invited; for it sometimes happens that the best wine is kept until the last, and the end is more than the beginning.

Let the teachers remember that the end of their labors is to show in relation to Christianity "what is." Let the exhorters remember that the end of their speech is to show "what ought to be"—obedience. And let the whole church remember that both teacher and exhorter must receive the reward due to their expense of *time* and *labor*, if the church would not mock God; but the scripture in relation to this matter, says God is not mocked. W. SCOTT.

Acceptable Worship not Will-Worship.

Brother Campbell,

THERE is nothing more manifest, than that the will of our heavenly Father is kept out of sight by the systems of men. I have lately been persuaded that there are a few prominent points exhibited in the revelation of God, which, if attended to, would overthrow the dogmas that are palmed on men in our day, as being a religion which God will own as acceptable to him.

The first of these is, that God has not, at any time, under any dispensation, authorized any human being to institute a plan or devise a way by which he could be approached by any of his fallen creatures. He always appointed the manner, the time, and the place. When the first pair lost Paradise, there was, in his mercy, a place appointed at the east of the garden, where he would accept their offering. Genesis iii. 23, 24, 25.

What made Abel's offering acceptable and Cain's not, but because the first was God's appointment, and the other Cain's own device? Heb. xi. 4. Enoch pleased God by walking in his counsel and not his own. Heb. xi. 5. "For without faith it is impossible to please God." And if faith can only be based on testimony, then when God begins we must begin to obey according to his direction; and where he has given no command we cannot render any acceptable worship. Now, if men would be instructed on this important subject, they must apply to God himself, and in tracing the history of the cloud of witnesses who obtained a good report through faith, and they will find that they exactly believed what God told them, and simply obeyed what he commanded them, and overcame every obstacle by this means. For example—Abraham believed and obeyed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness. Moses was commissioned by God to do what he did, and specially directed at every step; and the plan of the dispensation of which he was constituted mediator, was given to him by Jehovah himself on the holy mount; (Heb. viii. 5.) Not a pin, loop, or fringe was left to the discretion or wisdom of Moses; and not only so, but the whole service was minutely directed. When we look into the Old Testament, and see that God was alone the author of the plan by which, and through which, he could be approached by his creatures, what estimate can we put on the various inventions of men which have covered christendom for the last 1500 years, under the Christian *name?*

Do men suppose God less holy or less jealous of his honor under the new dispensation than he was under the former? or do men suppose he will be less severe in punishing those who despise his Son's precepts, that he formerly was on those who despised the precepts of of Moses? Let such consult the Apostle Paul, Heb. ii. 2, 3.

Again—we find that the instructions which the Apostles gave to the churches were confined to what they received from the Lord; and although the revelations came to them in different parcels, as they did to the Prophets of old; yet nothing is plainer than that they always taught, and only taught the people the mind of Christ, as the only rule of faith and manners in the kingdom of the Son. "God," said the Apostle Paul, "who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined into our [the Apostles'] hearts, that we [the Apostles] might give to the world who would receive it, the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." 2 Cor. iv. 6.

"I have received of the Lord," says Paul, "that which also I delivered unto you." 1 Cor. xi. 23. "In vain do you worship me," said the Saviour, "teaching for doctrine the precepts of men." "Who hath required this at your hand?" will be the answer of the Judge to many a devotee who will lay claim to his favor in the great day of accounts, who have employed their whole life in honoring and obeying the inventions of some mortal man like themselves, and neglecting the honor due to God their Saviour. "Let God be true, though every man should be a liar," should be the motto in the religion of every man who would be accepted at last by him who will judge righteously.

But it is a fact that the few who love and obey the Lord, will be, as they now are, evil spoken of. The reason why so many are afraid even to examine for themselves, much less dare they come out openly and acknowledge Jesus to be their King and the Governor in all things—because the clergy say all who do so are weak, deluded creatures; that they are fanatics, unitarians, &c.—because they just believe what God has been mercifully pleased to say to them, and obey just what he has commanded them, believing that this is the only way that they can please God, and enjoy peace here, and have the sure hope of eternal life hereafter. I would ask the gentlemen who so much fear that the reformers become unitarians, this question—Who honor Jesus Christ most, or acknowledge his character to be the most dignified—those who believe every word which he has spoken, obey all the laws which he has made, (refusing allegiance to every other;) or them who say, both in word and practice, that his word is not able to save, guide, or direct, and that the wisdom of men is indispensable as a guide to heaven? I leave this question for the creed-makers to answer.

The charge of unitarianism comes badly from those who have always preferred the wisdom of men to the wisdom which came down from heaven, which is the delight of those who are thus slandered by them; who acknowledged Jesus the Christ to possess all power in heaven and on earth; the Son of God, the only King and Lawgiver; the only name known among men through which salvation comes to the lost; and who must reign until he subdues all enemies, and judge and pass a righteous sentence on all the transactions of men; who will be owned both in heaven and on earth to be King of all kings and Lord of all Lords. C. F.

The First day of the Week is not the Seventh day.

Brother Campbell,

I NOW write to you for information on a subject which causes considerable contention between sects and parties with us, and has even been debated on in public, recently, by men of reasonable information and talents. The subject is simply this, *Which is the right Sabbath?*

Shortly after I subscribed for the *Harbinger*, in June last, my father's family being convinced by reading it how they stood with respect to the future state; and there being no proclaimers of the ancient order in these parts, I invited two proclaiming brethren who lived at a distance of about 20 miles, to come and preach at my father's house. Accordingly they did so. They are of the Baptist persuasion, though they disown all creeds, and go for the plain simplicity of the Bible. They have attended with us once-a-month since November last, in which time they have immersed ten persons in this neighborhood for the remission of sins—my mother, four sisters, and two bro-

thers were part of the number. My old father has not come out yet, though he has laid aside his *universal* doctrine. I hope the time is not far distant when he will yield obedience to the requisitions of the gospel.

Although the two brethren above named discard all creeds and confessions of faith, preach baptism for the remission of sins, &c. yet they hold to the old Jewish Sabbath. Just so far they differ from you. They read the Harbinger, and are well pleased with it, particularly the Extra on "*Regeneration.*" There appears to be a great stir among the people concerning the Sabbath. Some are searching the Scriptures for the change of the Sabbath—are turning to the seventh day, &c. W. D. L.

There never was but *one* Sabbath—the seventh day—the commemoration of the creation in six days. This was in the Jewish institution made a *type* of a rest which remains for the people of God. Jesus is the Christian's Sabbath. The Lord's day is by no apostle, prophet, scribe, or wise man called a Sabbath. The day of the resurrection and the day of the assembly of the Christians is a day of rest, of peace, of joy, a festival sacred to the Lord; but not a Jewish nor Patriarchal Sabbath. This subject is fully discussed in the *Christian Baptist*, vol. 1, page 121, 2d ed. We cannot now repeat what is there said. But let the reader consult and compare Col. ii. 16. and Hebs. iv. 1—9. if he desire to understand how the Apostles regarded the Sabbath. He that keeps the Sabbath of the Jews is a debtor to do the whole law. It is not the sanctification of the seventh part of time, but *the seventh day*, which God enjoined. The Sabbath could not be changed from the seventh day to the first day, for the reasons given for its observance; nor can the first day of the week be changed into a Jewish or Patriarchal Sabbath, for the reasons which consecrated it to the Lord. But the curious reader is referred to the article above alluded to. ED. M. H.

For the Millennial Harbinger.

BOSTON, *June 15th*, 1834.

Dear brother Campbell,

I AM happy to add to my little library the third edition of your New Testament, revised and enlarged. I am reading it with much interest, and, I hope, with some edification. I offer you my insignificant tribute of commendation for this labor of love—not because it is necessary to turn the scale in your favor against the emanations of sectarian bigotry which have been thrown into the other side; but because I believe the work will really conduce to a more correct understanding of the precious revelation of divine truth and love.

As I know your willingness to receive and examine any objections which may be tendered in love, I beg leave to call your attention to the following remark in the preface:—"To simplify still farther, and to comprehend under a few heads the whole apostolic writings, it may be said that there are *three* gospels, with their circumstances, which engross the whole volume." The suggestion of a writer in the Millennial Harbinger, some time ago, that "the everlasting gospel," mentioned in the Revelation to John, is in some respect a different gospel from that preached in Judea, Rome, Corinth, &c. appears

to me unsupported by any satisfactory evidence. I see no necessity for this departure from the pure speech of the living oracles, in order to classify different subjects in the apostolic writings. If you wish to "simplify," why not write and speak of "the gospel" declared "to the Jews," "to the Gentiles," and "to every nation, and tribe, and tongue, and people"? As you have so faithfully put the question to your opponents, "What Prophet or Apostle ever said thus and thus?" you are certainly entitled to the benefit of this question in the present case. What Prophet or Apostle, beloved, ever spoke or wrote of "*three gospels?*" You seem to think that the good news declared first to the Jews, is, by way of eminence, called "*the* gospel." But how can this be, when the same phrase is used in reference to the glad tidings preached to the Gentiles? And how can you consider the phrase "the gospel" pre-eminent to the phrase "the everlasting gospel"?

Now, brother, I have no more faith in three gospels than I have in three persons in Deity. I believe in one Lord, one faith, one gospel,* one immersion, one body, one God and Father of all. The gospel preached to the Gentiles, and which (blessed be the God of favor!) is to be proclaimed to every nation and tribe, is the same gospel preached to the Jews. If any man on earth, or any messenger from heaven preach any other, he is accursed. The proclamation of the everlasting good news to every nation, &c. (Rev. xiv. 6.) is indeed followed by the declaration that Babylon is fallen; but this last triumphant announcement is by another messenger. The first messenger proclaims the same glad tidings which are now proclaimed to us, requiring men to repent, or to fear and worship God, and to give him glory. The second proclaims the fall of Babylon the Great. The third testifies to the righteous judgments of God against those who worship the beast, and receive his mark on the forehead.——The favor of the Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit.

HENRY GREW.

Fragments---from Philologus.

SPIRIT, AND NOT WIND, AGAIN AND AGAIN.

"The Spirit breatheth where he will: and thou hearest his voice, but thou knowest not whence he cometh and whither he goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit."

SUCH is the reading of John iii. 8. in "The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, translated out of the Latin Vulgate, deligently compared with the Original Greek, and first published by the English College of Rheims, Anno 1582—with the original preface,

*I am no advocate for three gospels, more than I am for "one faith and one gospel." But I have no objections to say that there are many words of God, and but one word of God—many testimonies, yet but one testimony. For *illustration*, however, we may correctly say that there are three things called gospel, or three gospels spoken of in the New Testament, as Paul called the promise of Canaan the gospel preached to the Jews. (Hebs. iv.) There are many more good tidings than one in the New Testament. The birth of the Messiah is called *gospel* or *good news*. The resurrection from the dead was called *good news*. The downfall of Babylon will be *good news* when it comes to pass. This is all we meant to say when classifying the three great subjects which occupy all the pages of the New Testament. But "the present truth" and "*the* gospel," to us emphatically so called, is that which was first published in Jerusalem; and to the Gentiles it is *glad tidings of great joy* that God has made no difference between Jew or Gentile under the reign of his Son.

As we were illustrating a subject in our own way, and not propounding three distinct gospels in the passage alluded to, we did not suspect that any person would object to the number *three*. But the writer of the above *critique* has thought so much about *trinities* and *three* persons, that his ear is peculiarly delicate on that sound. Had I said *four* gospels, he might in all probability have read the volume alluded to four years without ever feeling any repugnance to this illustration, than I do to his making one faith and one gospel, as if the one faith did not include the one gospel! What is called *everlasting good news* in the Apocalypse yet appears to me not to allude to that spoken Acts ii.——*Ed. M. H.*

arguments, and tables, marginal notes, and annotations.—New York. Published by Jonathan Leavitt, 1834."

The Spirit breathes—And Ignatius, one of the Apostolical Fathers, in his Epistle to the Philadelphians, evidently referred to this passage, and understood it as we have rendered it in the following extract—

"For although some would have deceived me according to the flesh; yet the Spirit, being from God, is not deceived: for it knows both whence it comes and whither it goes, and reproves the secrets of the heart."

[*Archbishop Wake's translation—text of Vossius.*]

BORN AGAIN OF WATER.

In the above quoted Rhemish Testament the annotation on John iii. 5. reads thus:—

"As no man can enter into this world, nor have his life and being in the same, except he be born of his carnal parents: no more can a man enter the life and state of grace which is in Christ, or attain to life everlasting, unless he be born and baptized of water and the Holy Ghost. Whereby we see first this sacrament to be called our regeneration or second birth, in respect of our natural and carnal which was before. Secondly, that this sacrament consisteth of an entire element of water, and internal virtue of the Holy Spirit: wherein it excelleth John's baptism, which had the external element, but not the spiritual grace. Thirdly, that no man can enter into the kingdom of God, nor into fellowship of holy church without it. Whereby the Pelagians and Calvinists be condemned that promise life everlasting to young children that die without baptism, and all other that think only faith to serve, or the external element of water superfluous or not necessary: our Saviour's words being plain and general. Though in this case, God, which hath not bound his grace, in respect of his freedom to any sacrament, may and doth accept them as baptized, which either are martyred before they could be baptized, or else depart this life with vow and desire to have that sacrament, but by some remediless necessity could not obtain it. Lastly, it is proved that this sacrament giveth grace *ex opere operato*, that is of the work itself, which all Protestants deny, because it so breedeth our spiritual life in God, as our carnal birth giveth the life of the world."

All men cannot receive this *annotation*: but let him that is able, receive it.

THE TEMPLE OF GOD.

——"Let us inquire, therefore, whether there be any temple of God? Yes, there is: and that there, where himself declares that he would both make and perfect it. For it is written; and it shall be that as soon as the work shall be completed, the temple of the Lord shall be gloriously built in the name of the Lord. I find, therefore, that there is a temple. But how shall it be built in the name of the Lord? I will show you. Before that we believed in God, the habitation of our

heart was corruptible, and feeble, as a temple truly built with hands. For it was a house full of idolatry, a house of devils; inasmuch as there was done in it whatsoever was contrary to God. But it shall be built in the name of the Lord. Consider, how that the temple of the Lord shall be very gloriously built; and by what means that shall be, learn. Having received remission of our sins, and trusting in the name of the Lord, we are become renewed, being again created, as it were, from the beginning. Wherefore, God truly dwells in our house, that is, in us." [*Epistle of Barnabas, Wake's translation.*]

Progress of Reform.

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

New York City, June 29, 1834.

THE disciples who last season met for worship in Hudson street, have now removed to Mr. French's school room, next to the corner of Hudson, in King street; to which place we cordially invite any of the disciples who come from a distance, on business or otherwise, to unite with us in the worship of our Saviour on the first day of the week. On every Lord's day morning the disciples meet at half past 10 o'clock to break the loaf, &c. and at half past 3 o'clock for social worship; and in the evening, at early candle-lighting, for proclaiming the gospel to sinners. We are anxious to get a more commodious and central situation to meet in. As soon as such a room can be obtained, and we remove, we will inform our distant brethren of it.

About 7 weeks ago Dr. Philip G. Young, an able proclaimer, arrived here, highly recommended by the brethren at Braddock's Field and Pittsburg, and from the disciples in Philadelphia, (to which place he was on a visit,) to the fellowship and care of the brethren in King street, New York. We found him a bold, ardent, and devoted advocate of the truth. He cut deep into the heart of the King's enemies by the *Sword of the Spirit*. Though many were sorely wounded they were not slain. Brother Young's stay was about two weeks. Four hours before he left here for his home, by the way of Philadelphia, brother Silas E. Shepard, of Troy, Bradford county, Penn. arrived, and had an hour's interview with brother Young, but could not prevail on him to stop another week. He appeared to want to get into a warmer climate, where some would obey the gospel.

Brother Shepard travelled 200 miles, over a very rough road, by the way of Newburg, to New York, on purpose to see the disciples. He united, without delay, on the morning of the first day, five weeks ago, in fellowship exclusively with the brethren in King street, and continued with them until he left the city last Monday, having labored in this city and vicinity above four weeks with unwearied zeal and ability.

Although brother Young had raised the sleeping spirit of sectarianism from its slumbers, and it began to manifest its opposition to the word, brother Shepard was not daunted at all, but girded on the whole armor of God, and continued the combat in the re-proclamation of the "apostolic gospel," in an able and lucid manner, in different parts of the city, to from one hundred to fifteen hundred hearers; but no fruit from their united labors appeared, owing to the strong prejudice of sectarianism and other causes of opposition.

It appeared evident to the disciples that no permament good would result by laboring in so many different places in the city where prejudice exhibited itself so strongly. We, therefore, concluded more real good would be effected by confining our labors entirely to the brethren's meeting room in King street, however small and inconvenient. We found it would accommodate

200 persons comfortably. We therefore advertised and held a protracted meeting, conducted by brother Shepard, for two weeks, commencing on Wednesday evening of each week, (Saturday excepted,) and closing on Lord's day evenings—the first effort of the kind made by the disciples in this city. The fruit of this effort was, eight persons added to the church—very promising members; making our present number 28, viz.—13 male and 15 female members, most of whom appear to be all alive to the salvation of the world; and we have no doubt this good spirit of saving sinners by the union of the disciples and the reproclamation of the apostolic gospel, will be kept alive and increase in the hearts of the disciples here by the proclaimers coming on, and thus keeping this blessed spirit in motion.

The disciples here, we assure the brethren in the West, are willing to help themselves—(though weak, they feel strong in the Lord)—and to aid the proclaimers who visit them, all that lies in their power—to provide for them that the gospel may not be hindered. We therefore affectionately invite the proclaimers to come to our city and help us against the mighty, that the strong holds of scepticism and sectarianism may give way, that thousands who are now held in bondage by men may be induced to break loose from their attachment to men's persons, their schemes, and discretionary measures, and press against all opposition into the kingdom of Jesus, and so be saved; useful here and happy in the blessed hope of everlasting life.

Signed in behalf of the disciples meeting in King street, by their unanimous consent, on Lord's day, June 29, 1834—

BENJAMIN S. HENDRICKSON,
ISAAC HATFIELD,
FRANCIS DUNCAN,
JAMES SAUNDERS,
JAMES OVINGTON.

P. S. The reason why the Elder (*Jonathan Hatfield*) did not sign the above, is, his having gone on business about 8 weeks ago, to Upper Canada, City of the Falls, where he may probably stop for some months.

Brethren Johnson & Stone, of Georgetown, Ky.—W. Scott, of Cincinnati—John Thomas of Richmond, Va.—and any periodical in the United States that advocates the cause of the reformation, will give the above an insertion, and oblige their brethren in New York.

SHELBY COUNTY, *Ky.* July 4, 1834.

I THINK in the last year I have immersed about twenty. The truth has a progressive effect on the people. Brother J. A. Swanea has lately immersed six or eight at Floyd's Fork, which is near me; brother R. Seaton, some at Chenowith's Run, also a neighboring congregation. In every place around me there is more success than in the places above named; the congregation to which I am attached being South Long Run.

ZACHEUS CARPENTER.

FRANKLIN, *Ill.* July 4, 1834.

THE *good cause* is still gaining ground in Illinois, especially in the Military Tract. In Pike county, on the 15th of June, brother T. Williams immersed seven persons, all of whom are good citizens, of unblemished character. In Rushville, on last Lord's day, seven were added to the congregation. This congregation, first organized on the 29th December last, with 22 members, now numbers 54; with the prospect of some additions soon. They are living in harmony among themselves, and growing in favor with the people. May this continue to be the case!

There is much need of assistance from teaching brethren in the Military Tract. Can you not induce some of the brethren of your acquaintance to visit this section?

H. A. CYRUS.

WILMINGTON, *Ohio*, July 7, 1834.

WE recently had a big meeting in this place. Brother Scott and others—say four or five ministering brethren attended. Brother Scott was in fine health and spirits, and addressed one of the largest and most attentive audiences that ever assembled in this place. Twelve were immersed. Sectarianism received a wound, which, if not deadly, will not be very soon cured. The disciples here have been confirmed in the faith, and witnessed an additional evidence of the power of the truth. The various sheepfolds were broken down, notwithstanding the efforts of their several shepherds to keep them from hearing. Their curiosity was so excited that it was impossible to prevent their attendance, and a large number of the various sects were present on the Lord's day.

WM. R. COLE.

LOUISA COUNTY, *Va.* July 10, 1834.

THERE is a strange state of things existing in this neighborhood. The Regular Baptists have become very *irregular* in their mode of preaching and acting for the conversion of their hearers. They seem determined to increase their numbers, by some means, which they have succeeded in doing very considerably in this county within a few months. Paul the Apostle thanked God that the converted, to whom he wrote, had obeyed from the heart the mould of doctrine into which they were cast. Into what mould of doctrine the late converts were cast, seems to be matter of doubt to the hearers and lookers-on, as a considerable part of the instructions are secret. For the sake of the truth I will give a statement of the proceedings of these *Baptist* preachers in the late revival.

In the first place, then, they appoint a protracted meeting. The preachers from other places are invited to attend. When the assembly have met, some one of the preachers addresses them, but not even *about* the gospel, in a manner calculated to excite animal passions; and when by this means the people become moved, the preacher directs the brethren to sing, while he descends from the pulpit and commences talking in a *low* voice to those who have taken the anxious seats. These seats are given up, at the request of the preachers, to those who wish to "*get religion;*" and all who wish to "get religion" are invited to occupy them. (The old lay brethren seem not to understand this mode, and some of them take no part in it.) While the multitude sing the preachers continue the *low talk* to the mourner; but soon as the singing ends the talk ends till another song is raised; and then, and not before, the secret instructions begin again. This order continues from day to day until the mourners say they are converted. They then tell the preachers how they feel, and an appointment is made to *baptize* them two or three weeks hence! Some, however, are baptized sooner.

Some of the hearers are not quite satisfied of the propriety of these secret teachings; for they say, if there is any good in them, let all hear it. But it seems the converts are not indebted to the preachers for any instruction upon the subject of baptism, (unless secret;) for one of the old brethren, who has been a regular attendant, told me he did not know that he had heard one word from any preacher upon this subject during the revival!

The Lord be praised that our labors at Bethany have not been in vain! Seven persons have lately confessed their faith in Jesus, and were immersed for remission of sins. One of them said he had been looking for something which he could not find, but was now disposed to rely upon the promises.

J. M. BAGBY.

HARDEMAN COUNTY, *Ten.* June 25, 1834.

THE reformation is progressing rapidly in the north part of the Western District of Tennessee. I heard from Paris, in Henry county, a few days ago. There had been a meeting at that place on Saturday and Sunday, at which a considerable number were immersed. My informant stated that the prospect in that section of the state was truly flattering.

JOSEPH W. MATTHEWS.

GREECE, Monroe county, *New York*, July 21, 1834.

A SMALL congregation was established here last winter. Seven made the good confession by being buried with Christ in immersion. We now number about twenty. Brother J. Spoor is our chief speaker. Brother Moss thinks there are in Western New York about nine hundred disciples—say from Buffaloe to Onondaga county, East and North. We should be very glad to see any of the older reformers come this way. We are situated about eight miles west of the city of Rochester, nearly on the canal, and directly on the celebrated Ridge Road, from Rochester to Lewistown, Upper Canada.

SAMUEL CLARKE.

GEORGETOWN, *Ky.* August 4, 1834.

THE churches in this country do not advance in the cause of reform as fast as I should like to see them. Several of the teaching brethren are not hearty in what we believe to be the ancient order of the church. There are but few churches that meet every first day to keep the ordinances. They are too much in the monthly system.

There is also a want of zeal and energy on the part of the brethren in relation to Evangelists, or rather in reference to supporting them. There is a constant cry for preaching, and the people flock in hundreds to hear. But there is no system among the churches, or method of remunerating the laborers for their services. There are enough brethren in this section of the state to support six or eight Evangelists. They have but two, and they are barely supported. There must be a change in the state of things, or the cause will languish.

Two weeks ago I was with brother Thomas M. Allen, at Antioch. Five, I think, made the good confession. I have just returned from a four days' meeting at Clear Creek. Eight persons made the good confession, and were immersed. The good cause is still prospering.

B. F. HALL.

Walnut Grove, Tazwell county, Ill. August 8, 1834.

I ARRIVED here about the 15th of May last, since which I have immersed into Jesus the Messiah upwards of thirty persons. The prospects in the far West for the progress of the Redeemer's kingdom are flattering.

W. DAVENPORT.

Spring Hill, Tipton county, Ten. August 9, 1834.

I THINK we are getting the ear of the people in this vicinity, and gaining a more respectable standing among them, since their minds have been disabused to a limited extent by the labors of our beloved brother P. Smith. The sects are still violent against us, and are not content with shutting us out of their meeting houses, but have actually attempted to exclude us the court house by monopoly. If we do not become more scattered than at present, I trust we shall make some progress in the good cause. Some of our most talented brethren are not yet permanently settled among us, among whom is our beloved brother Smith. May the Lord make us a blessing in this moral wilderness! We wish our brethren who labor in the word and teaching, to call on us in the vicinity of Covington, Tipton county, Tennessee.

N. B. Our present number is 28. J. W. JEFFRESS.

Richmond, Va. August 15, 1834.

THE good cause of truth is still progressing slowly in this part of Virginia. I left here last Thursday in order to carry my wife to the country for her health, and had the pleasure of attending a three days' meeting held by the disciples at Painesville, Amelia county, where you preached last fall. The meeting commenced on Friday last. We had a very interesting time of it, though the weather was excessively warm and dry. The ministering brethren present were Elder Townes, (the Pastor of the congregation,) Ainslie, and

brother James Jeter. No one spoke but brother Ainslie, who preached once each day. The congregation on Friday was small; on Saturday we had a good number. After preaching one was immersed into the name of Jesus Chris for the remission of sins. Lord's day morning we met pretty early for worship, which was attended to in pretty good and decent order. At 11 o'clock brother Ainslie addressed a large congregation (for the house was filled to overflowing) from Acts ii. The result was, that seven white, and one colored person of good standing and sound intellect, came forward and made the good confession; after which we broke the one loaf with the brethren. On Monday we went up to Jamestown, Prince Edward; but it was so very warm and dusty that only a few assembled. I left brethren Ainslie and Townes on Tuesday morning on their way to Sandy River meeting house, near Nottaway line. I have heard nothing more from them since. We are getting on in this place but slowly. Brother Thomas is now with us.

EDWD. FOWELL.

Monticello, Ky. August 19, 1834.

BROTHER John Smith has been recently among us. During his stay sixteen made the good confession, and were, by him, immersed into the apostolic faith. Shortly after his departure nine more were added to the congregation, and many more seem to be inquiring the way of the Lord. We number at this time about two hundred and sixty-five. The sects, especially the Methodists, are doing their utmost against us; but all their raving, ranting, perverting and falsifying avail them but little. Truth is mighty, and though but feebly advocated, will prevail. JONATHAN S. FRISBIE.

Baltimore, Md. August 19, 1834.

BROTHER G. AUSTIN accompanied me to Hartford county. The second Lord's day in July I preached in the Union Chapel concerning the name of Jesus, as developed in the 2d chapter of Philippians. After showing the power of the name for the remission of sins, an invitation was given, when two females came out to confess that name. When we had broken the loaf brother Austin gave an impressive exhortation to the disciples and the world. On last Lord's day but one I went again to the same place, and immersed a man who had been a Methodist five years. The Methodists in the neighborhood have taken the alarm, and on last Lord's day their circuit preacher delivered their *stereotyped* sermon on baptism. One of the females I first immersed had been an exemplary member of the class a long time, and for her behaviour now she received from the leader a letter of excommunication. He told her he was no more her *leader!* a sentiment she wished not to contradict; but said in return *he had been her leader long enough!*

JAMES HENSHALL.

New Haven, Hamilton county, Ohio, August 28, 1834.

IN and about Harrison, since last January, there has been quite an ingathering. In January last there were but three disciples in Harrison—now they amount to about eighty. There is a good prospect of the whole surrounding country becoming obedient to the faith of the gospel. Meetings are generally well attended with crowds of people. T. KIMPTON.

Nelson county, Ky. August 18, 1834.

TRUTH IS TRIUMPHING, AND LIGHT IS DISPELLING ERROR, REVOLUTIONS, COMMOTIONS, DREAMS, &c.

Mr. Campbell,

Dear Sir—This is an age of reformation, indeed. Truth is advancing, light is exhibited, and man is asserting his rights. Babylon, the confusion among the religious sectaries, has caused many to examine the foundation on which they are built and standing. The reformation for which you have plead for the last twelve years is moving onward, and onward will be its march, in spite

of human opposition—because the truth is mighty above all things, and will prevail. The principles of the reformation have made their way into this section of the state, and many are taking a bold and decisive stand on the side of the Bible, free from human creeds and opinions of men. But before I proceed I will give you an account of a dream which occurred about the time the Salem Association was in session last October. The dreamer is a preacher who has opposed you in his feeble way much, and is frequently telling the people, "The reformation is sinking." This is the dream, as we have learned:—He saw a man on a large horse, in a large body of water; the water very muddy. The horse was splashing and throwing himself about, and was nigh drowning; and the rider received his seven wounds: but finally the horse reached the shore. He did not call on the wise men, the astrologers, the soothsayers, as did a heathen king, but he gave the dream and the interpretation thereof himself. The interpretation, as we have heard is this:—Now he had no doubt but that it was Campbell, and that Campbellism was about to receive its last and fatal stab; that it was about to sink and die away. I presume his meaning was, the reformation nicknamed Campbellism. The two wounds you received (or *Campbellism* as he calls it) I presume were the acts of the Association which passed about that time; and I will here insert them from the Minutes:—

6th Item.—A Query from Cedar Creek Church, *to wit:*—Is it agreeable to gospel order or the Scriptures of sacred truth, for the United Baptists to receive the baptism of the reformers as valid?———An answer was proposed and adopted as follows:—*It is not.*

14th Item.—On motion of brother Abner King, *Resolved*, That the churches composing this Association be advised not to open their meeting houses for preaching by any person holding the doctrines of A. Campbell, or who call themselves Reformers, or of the Christian order, commonly called New Lights.

Having passed these two bulls, and believing they had, or would produce the desired effect, they returned to their homes full of vision, believing the dream; but twenty days had not been added to those which had passed away no more to return, before two of those preachers were at Bloomfield, and speaking in the congregation the words of eternal life. Occasionally the friends had visits from three or four of those preachers of the ancient gospel. The minds of the people became more and more enlightened, and the opposers began to say. 'It will not do to let these people alone, for they will come and take away our union [the Association] and do us great harm.' So they wrote to one of their friends to come up and administer a dose which would have the desired effect. He came and did as they wished, and compelled upwards of sixty members of the Bloomfield church to separate, and they were among the best members they had in the church. These brethren were determined to be freemen, and they are going on to worship God according to his laws. Several have been added from the world by baptism and confession, and some from the Baptist ranks. At Mill Creek, about ten miles distant from Bloomfield, the church have divided; six at first left in the opposition, and a few more since. I expect in Bardstown ten or more whites have left the church in the opposition. The balance stand on the word of God. At Cedar Creek some have been expelled for going to hear Mr. Creath preach, (the Senior,) and erecting a stand for him; and these were the best members they had. Some have made the good confession here, and a church will be organized before long on the word of God.

And now comes the account of Cox's Creek. A few of her members broke bread with the brethren at Mill Creek, for which they were arraigned at the bar of Cox's Creek Church to give an account of this heinous crime. Mill Creek, you will remember, is as yet in connexion with the Association. One of the four was asked if he believed that Christ died for all. His reply was, "I believe just what the Scriptures teach." Upon which declaration one cried, "Away with him!" I reckon he thought it was not fit he should live; so he was cut off. They brought forward a young lady, and after asking her whe-

ther she believed in Campbellism, &c. (in reply to which she appealed to the Bible,) she was put to death. O, Babylon! great are thy crimes! How many innocent hearts have been made to bleed by thy hands! The leaven of the ancient gospel, however, is still working. The church at Springfield, about 18 miles from Bloomfield, have thrown aside their human creed and taken the Bible alone as the foundation on which they are determined to stand. Some other churches are *infected* (as the Baptists call it) with the principles. The fields are white in many places to harvest. The harvest is great, but the laborers are few. We want more brethren in the field who will go forth with a determination to wield the Sword of the Spirit. The good cause is advancing generally in the usual way, which is additions by immersion and from other churches. The Baptists are frequently uniting.

May the smiles of heaven's King be on you and protect you to the day of eternity! and may you ever hold fast the great light of truth, the Bible, while you travel on this earthly ball! AN OBSERVER.

Bardstown, Ky. August 30, 1834.

I HAVE taken up my pen to give you a hasty sketch of the religious state of affairs in this region of country. The last Salem Association, (held in October, 1833,) by some strange infatuation, passed three decrees—the first declaring the baptism of the reformers invalid; the second declaring the baptism administered by the Christian brethren invalid; and the third was in the following words: "*Resolved*, That the churches composing this Association be advised not to open their meeting houses for preaching by any person holding the doctrines of A. Campbell, or who call themselves Reformers; or of the Christian order, commonly called New Lights." The messengers from Bardstown, Bloomfield, and Mill Creek churches, as also some from other churches, were dissatisfied with the arbitrary decisions of the Association. The question soon after arose at Bloomfield, Bardstown, and Mill Creek, *Whether they would obey the decrees or not.* At Bardstown and Mill Creek, they resolved, by overwhelming majorities, that they would not shut their doors against the Reformers, &c. Bardstown church, at last Association, numbered 101—Mill Creek 91.

On the second Saturday in July, at Mill Creek, a motion was again made to close the doors, when it again failed by a large majority. Six of the white members there withdrew from us and enrolled their names as a separate body, and appointed a meeting on the first Saturday in August to organize themselves into a church, and to receive into their union and fellowship all who would follow them. They met accordingly, and received an addition from the church of some 6 or 7 more, making in all 12 or 13 whites, besides some few blacks, as I have understood; and notwithstanding slander calumny, and misrepresentation with her thousand tongues have been very busy, yet I feel assured the brethren stand firm and unmoved. The Saturday following, at Bardstown, an old lover of Calvinism inquired whether the church would send messengers to the next Association; to which the church responded, by a large majority, that she would not. The old gentleman then made an appointment to meet on a subsequent day, and requested all who were friendly to Associations to meet with him. They accordingly met, and some 10 or 12 white members and some few blacks enrolled their names and organized themselves into a church, leaving the great body and most substantial reading and intelligent members firmer in the reformation. Bloomfield, which is in this county, about 11 miles distant, was composed of about 220 white members, and some 90 blacks. Between 60 and 70 intelligent white members have cast away human traditions and stand firm upon the one sure foundation, as you have already been informed. They have since received some 5 or 6 by confession and baptism, some few by letter, and some few from the old Baptists. At Bardstown I baptized one young gentleman on the third Lord's day of this month. At Cedar Creek, 5 miles west of Bardstown, they excluded two of the most intelligent brethren in the church for what they call *heresy*, but wha Peter and Paul called *the truth*. I baptized a very intelligent lady there at my

last meeting, some few weeks since; and another excellent lady received, who is to be baptized to-morrow; and I expect to constitute a church there this day week. Cox Creek Church, about 6 miles north of this place, excluded four of her best members at her last meeting for what they called *heresy*, but what the Apostles called *believing and obeying the truth*. The sects seem all to be united against us; but truth is mighty and will prevail.

I have just seen a brother from Springfield, the county seat for Washington county, about 16 miles east of this place, who informs that the church in Springfield, which numbers about 60, have come out unanimous on the side of reformation, and that one or two other churches in that Association (South District) are under dealings of the Association, and it is believed that a large number will stand firm in the reformation. I am told the council meets to-morrow. I also learned from the same informant that one of the ablest preachers in that association has come out for reformation.

SAMUEL CARPENTER.

Nashville, Tenn. September 2, 1834.

IN religious matters we have nothing new here. Brother Adams is immersing the people all around the country. I think he averages 10 or 15 a week. But the Lord only knows what will be the end. I often fear no great reformation will ever take place in our life time. MOSES NORVELL.

PARIS, Bourbon County, *Ky.* September 5, 1834.

Brother Campbell—I have been one of your constant readers ever since the commencement of your editorial labors, and it is with pleasure I bear testimony to their wide-spread usefulness. I have been individually much profited by them, and it has been chiefly in having my attention turned to the living oracles. It is greatly to be regretted that so little attention is generally given by christians to reading and studying the word of God; for it, like every other book, to be understood must be read connectedly and studied, and that prayerfully, and then a cheerful submission to all its requirements constitutes the perfection of christian character.

I have taken my pen in hand to write to you, for the first time, to give you a short account of some very interesting circumstances that have lately transpired in this place, believing that you and the religious public would be gratified in hearing of them. To make my narrative compete I will commence with the origin of the Baptist church that was constituted in this place a number of years since under the labors of brother J. Vardeman, which was built avowedly upon the word of God, but its constitution contained some items that went very far to neutralize and negative that declaration. But some years afterwards brother G. Gates succeeded brother Vardeman in the pastoral care of said church; during which time a number of us, and among the rest brother Gates himself, embraced the views contended for by yourself and others, who urge the necessity of a reformation and a return to the ancient order of things. Every thing moved on harmoniously for a considerable length of time under his labors; but at length some of the brethren, opposed to the reformation, began to be dissatisfied and find fault, particularly with the teaching of brother Gates, for indeed none other could be urged against him, for he is admitted by all to be one of the most amiable and exemplary christians any where to be found; but under the influence of a true sectarian spirit and a zeal for the traditions of the fathers, an effort was made to dismiss him from the bishop's office in the church. But this failed by a vote of nearly 3 to 1. The minority being thus disappointed, determined to separate themselves from us; and, as a preparatory step, they drew upa paper, setting forth their objection to the views contended for by the advocates for reformation, and declaring their determination to separate from us, proposing a friendly division, and procured as many signatures to it as possible, and afterwards submitted it to the church; but the majority determined that they would take no part in dividing the church, as they were in principle opposed to rending the body of Christ, which should be *one*. Those who had signed said paper then seceded from us and organized themselves into a church, claiming to be the original church, and were so recognized by the Association. After the division some who had been members of the body seemed undecided in their course, and stood aloof from both parties, and it was uncertain which they intended to be identified with, or whether with either, which threw us into a confused and disorganized condition. And there had also existed in this place for several years a body of people called "the Christian Church," almost all of whom had embraced the views of the reformation, and were disposed to go into the practice of the ancient order of things, with whom for some time we had been in the habit of intercommunion; and many of the brethren in both churches were anxious "out of the twain to make one new man, so making peace," and thus unite our strength, moral, intellectual, and pecuniary, for the advancement of the common cause. Accordingly at a meeting of the reformed church on the third Lord's day in August last, after a discourse from brother James Challen, (who is in the habit of meeting with us once a month,) from the 17th chapter of John, in which he set forth, in a very able and impressive manner, the importance of union among Christians, the following resolution was proposed and adopted by the church without dissent:—

"Whereas, owing to the confused and disorganized condition in which this church finds itself, growing out of the unfortunate division which took place in the body some time since, and to which other causes have also contributed; and there being some things in its constitution which we do not approve—*Therefore resolved*, That we will enrol ourselves anew; and all who have

been baptized (i. e. immersed) upon a profession of their faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and are in good standing, and walking orderly as followers of our common Lord, are affectionately invited to come forward and enrol their names also; and those who thus enrol themselves shall be considered a church of our Lord Jesus Christ, "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone, to be called the Church of Christ in Paris, and we will then go into an organization of the body after the model of the apostolic churches."

Whereupon nearly all of those present, who belonged to the two bodies, came forward and enrolled themselves, and others have continued to do so since, until our number now exceeds one hundred. We postponed the further organization of the church until the 5th Lord's day in said month, at which time brother Gates (who now resides at Louisville) and brethren John T. Johnson and B. F. Hall were with us, when we had a meeting of three days continuance. It was a time of great harmony and love, and the brethren seemed indeed to be of "one heart and one soul," and could testify from experience "how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." We were greatly confirmed and strengthened by the visit of the brethren, who exhorted us to "endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." We then completed the organization of the church by the election of four Elders or Bishops, and four Deacons, (amongst the former was brother Gates, who never withdrew his membership owing to his not having located himself permanently—he therefore enrolled his name and continued his membership with us.) The Lord being our keeper, we are determined to meet every Lord's day, and endeavor to "continue steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking bread and in prayers."——I remain yours in the gospel hope,

H. M. BLEDSOE.

[From the Cross and Baptist Journal, of the 8th August, 1834.]

FRANKFORT, Ky. July 28, 1834.

To Alexander Campbell, of Bethany, Brooke county, Virginia.

SIR—In the pamphlet which you presumptuously and falsely denominate the "*Millennial Harbinger*," No. 7, vol. 5, pages 311—13, you have taken a notice of the remarks which I made in the *Cross and Baptist Journal*, of June 6, relative to Georgetown College, which demands my emphatic attention

Giving the go-by to your ungentlemanly and scurrilous play of words, in regard to my name and the name of my paper, I shall at once approach that portion of your remarks for which I shall demand reparation. You state, "Our readers, acquainted with this quondam editor, now half publisher of the Ohio *Cross and Baptist Journal*, will know how much to subtract from the following letter, taken from its pages, under date of June 6, and what rebate and discount to make to his assertions."

Now, sir, this is taking high ground. Here you have taken the liberty to impugn my veracity, and in a manner the most vile and injurious—by insinuations *For this you must atone.* I demand at your hands to point out in what particulars I have, in the articles in question, misrepresented or exaggerated the facts spoken of; or, upon failure, to give up the name of your informant, who has led you into error. I repeat, *I demand this at your hand—a right.*

If you suppose, sir, that now I am unarmed with a periodical for self-defence, you will be permitted to slander me with impunity, you are mistaken. You shall give redress, or I will seek it through a source, and in terms, which, I have been satisfied, the interests of the religious community have long since required. Am I not able, sir, to prove, by witnesses of high standing for credibility and piety, that you are A NOTORIOUS SLANDERER AND COMMON LIAR? Nay, further, am I not able to establish, beyond controversy, that, in at least fifty instances, since you commenced your editorial career, you have flagrantly

violated the truth in matters essentially slanderous, and, in many instances, knowingly and intentionally! and if you will challenge me to it, I will at once embark in the undertaking. And in doing this, I will give your own words, with the page and volume, and along side of it I will give the evidences of the witnesses; and I will publish the whole in pamphlet form, and circulate it through all the width and breadth of the land; and it shall be acknowledged, as I apprehend, by the large body of the community, that I have more than succeeded. All this I flatter myself I am able to do; and I repeat, if you will challenge me to the undertaking, the Lord being my helper, I WILL DO IT.

This, sir, is a labor which I intended, long since, to have performed; and I should have done so, had you not, years ago retreated and taken no more notice of me, and ever since, till now, have kept your promise. But now, finding me disarmed, dastard like you skulk from your retreat, and give me a raking, slanderous fire, supposing that I have not the means of repelling it. But your artifice shall not shield you. It becomes necessary that your want of veracity should be fully established. Self-defence, the defence of the characters of the most pious and useful divines, both of the living and the dead, the cause of God and of Christ on earth, make it imperiously necessary that your reckless disregard of truth should be dragged before the public eye, unmasked as much as possible of religious parade and literary sophistry. In the very notice you have taken of my remarks, a part of which I have here extracted, you have departed from the truth, in at least eight or ten instances, and I can prove it conclusively and satisfactorily before any impartial tribunal.

Had I any good reason to hope that you are a child of God, an heir to an incorruptible inheritance, I would tremble thus to write. On this subject, however, I cannot doubt. I must judge from the evidence before me, and the rules laid down by the Holy Spirit: "All liars shall have their part in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone." Rev. xxi. 8. "Whoso privily slandereth his neighbor, him will I cut off." Psalm ci. 5. And further, having the strongest reasons to believe that you have, by ascribing to the devil the works of the Holy Spirit in the conversion of sinners, committed the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, which is not to be forgiven in this world nor in the world to come, and for which we are commanded not to pray, I am constrained to believe, that if an Apostle were now here on earth, he would accost [you] as he did Elymas of old, "O! full of all subtlety, and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness! wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord!"

This is faithful dealing, sir. I intend it to be such. Your crimes demerit a just retribution. Who that are pious and godly, and have stood in your way, have you not slandered and attempted to degrade! I will not at this time undertake to enumerate them. But I think it probable that I may hereafter do it. If I should not, the day is rapidly rolling on, when, at the bar of Eternal Justice, the books will be opened, and their names will be revealed in your presence. Awful, indeed, must be the account laid up in store.

I now, sir, await your reply. I have weighed the consequences which this letter may incur, and I am ready to meet them, let them come in what shape they may. Resting on the arm of Heaven for justice, I neither dread nor regard them.

Yours faithfully,

URIEL B. CHAMBERS.

A few Remarks on the above Letter.

So *writes* Uriel B. Chambers, and so *publishes* J. Stevens; the former the Editor of two *extinct* journals—the latter the present Editor of the *Cross & Baptist Journal.*

Gentle reader, with this climax of scurrility and abuse before us, may we not exclaim, Are these the Chiefs, the Scribes, and Pastors of the Baptists in the West! Well may these spiritual guides of the people—models of christian taste and good manners, preach a christian spirit, and commend justice, truth, and goodness!!! Is this the rage of infuriate demons, or the breathings of the *Good* Spirit?

That infidel Jews should have accosted the Messiah as a liar, a blasphemer, as having a demon, as Beelzebub—that blind and infatuated Pagans and Jews should have called the Apostles *deceivers, pestilent fellows, seditious,* and *unfit to live,* may find some extenuation in *their* times and circumstances; but how shall we extenuate a similar spirit and a similar style in the professed admirers of the precepts and examples of the Messiah and his Apostles!

I can say before him whose eye pierces all nature through, that from my soul I pity these men—the *writer* and the *publisher.* I am ashamed for them. In the presence of the duellist, raging for the blood of his fellow-man—in the presence of the decent sceptic, the deist, and the atheist—nay, in the presence of the most debauched political partizan from Georgia to Maine, I am ashamed for *Uriel B. Chambers* and *J. Stevens!*

I am glad to think, that, amongst the *Baptists,* (a people for whom I have done much—suffered much; and amongst whom there are thousands I cordially love and esteem,) there are but few, *very few,* who will not, in unqualified terms, repudiate such outpourings of gall and bitterness. If the malicious publications of Mr. Chambers do not an injury to the Baptist cause in the West, which all their missionaries in the present generation cannot repair, I shall be much mistaken. Some of the patrons of the "Cross & Baptist Journal," I am informed, have already entered their dissent from the course of its present Editor (Mr. Stevens) in the above affair; and he has promised to mend his manners hereafter. If it were a worthy undertaking to reply to such calumnies, (but *they refute themselves,*) I would take their own rules and precedents, and find by them as many *lies* (to use their favorite language) in Paul's Epistles, as they can show in all my writings.

Some have said, "Will you not make an example of Uriel B. Chambers? Has he not violated the laws of the land? Is not the letter actionable, and is he not a responsible person?" To such I reply,

that if he were a responsible person, (of which I have much reason to doubt;) and if I could make an example of him, it is to me hardly questionable—seeing I have already suffered almost every species of slander and abuse rather than to seek redress by the laws of the land, determined as I have been from the beginning never to authorize the enemy to say, 'You have defended yourself,' or 'You have sought to avenge your enemy by the strong arm of the law'—I say, it is hardly questionable whether I had not better follow the example of him who when he suffered threatened not, and reviled not in return, than to make an example of Uriel B. Chambers. And may I not add, that were I thus to meet him before Cesar, I should have to plead that the defamation of Uriel B. Chambers *is* slander, and that *he has power to injure my reputation for righteousness and truth;* NEITHER OF WHICH I DO AS YET HONESTLY BELIEVE. If he had any other documents to lay before my readers, on which to ground his foul imputations, than my writings, now in the hands of thousands, I might be persuaded to think otherwise; but he has not.

That our present readers and *posterity* may have a specimen of what we have had to endure in contending for the primitive faith and morals, I have given them the preceding letter. Whether they shall regard it as the gall and wormwood of a sectarian and disappointed spirit, or as a specimen of the wisdom that comes from above—pure and peaceable, gentle and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and of good fruit, without partiality and hypocrisy—needs not the eye of a Prophet to foretell.

I will only add, that on reading the preceding letter I never felt more joy in the anticipation of the final judgment, nor a stronger conviction of the need of such a disclosure as the righteous Judge has promised to make on that great and glorious occasion.——That these deluded and misguided sinners may be brought to true repentance, and make restitution, that so they may obtain mercy on that day, is the unfeigned prayer of THE EDITOR.

Religion.

LIKE snow that falls where waters glide,
Earth's pleasures melt away;
They rest on time's resistless tide,
And but a moment stay.
But joys that from religion flow,
Like stars that gild the night,
Amid the darkest gloom of woe
Shine forth with sweetest light.

Religion's ray no clouds obscure;
But o'er the Christian's soul
It sheds a radiance calm and pure,
Though tempests round him roll.
His heart may break 'neath sorrow's stroke;
But, to its latest thrill,
Like diamonds shining when they're broke,
THAT RAY WILL LIGHT IT STILL.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Number X.——Volume V.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Bethany, Va. October, 1834.

The Millennium---No. 2.

Mr. M'CORKLE reasons too much from analogy—too much from analogy to be convincing. But his reasoning from analogy is even more specious than his reasoning from type to antitype. He often tells us that the history and fortunes of the Jewish church typify the history of the Gentile church. Let it be admitted that the Jewish people were a typical people, and their history typical of ours; and what follows?—That the Christian church is to end as did the Jewish church—by a similar visitation? So affirms my lay brother. But, then, where is the antitype? Is the antitype of famine, sword, and fire, *famine, sword, and fire?* Is the antitype of temporal judgments, *temporal judgments?* Either he or I have wholly misunderstood the nature of types. Babylon, with me, is a type; but not of *of a literal city*— of an ecclesiastical city, and not of *a city of brick houses.* Famine may be a type; but can it be *a type of famine?* The Jewish Captivity and Return may be a type; but it cannot be *the type of a literal captivity and return!* So he seems to reason; for he alleges that "if the past were a type of the present, the present must close as did the past." If the former closed by temporal judgments, then the present dispensation must close with temporal judgments. I would rather suppose it ought to be with *spiritual* judgments, if the former were a type of the latter. Light is a metaphor, but not of light. Temporal judgments or calamities may be a metaphor or type, but not of temporal calamities. There is a spiritual Jerusalem, Egypt, and Sodom—a spiritual Babylon, too, if by *spiritual* we mean figurative. But the figurative and the literal are not literally the same.

I am doubtless understood; and if so, may I not affirm, that if the Jewish dispensation, the people under it, and God's government of them, were types of the Christian dispensation, the people under it,

and God's government of them; then, on that hypothesis, the present church cannot end as did the Jewish; for if it do, then the close of the former is not a type of the close of the latter. Noah's salvation in an ark during the deluge, Peter says, has its antitype in christian immersion; but is there an ark or a deluge in the antitype? If, then, the Jewish church in its close was a type of the Christian in its close, that the latter may be the antitype, there must not be literally sword, famine, or fire in the consummation of the present dispensation.

But again, my good brother Samuel says, in very strong terms, that the church is never to come out of the wildernes—he defies any one to show in the prophecies an intimation of her return. His words are, "The church is never to come up out of the wilderness. I challenge the text, the solitary text to the contrary. It is one of the wretched blunders of our teachers, and palmed on the world as Bible." Then query on his doctrine of types—Where is the antitype for the Jews coming up out of the wilderness? Did God's ancient church never come up out of the wilderness? And may I not add, that if the history of the Jews be a type of the history of the Gentile church; and the Jews were delivered from the literal Babylon, must we believe that the Christian church, now in Babylon, is never to come out of Babylon, but to be destroyed within her walls? Is there not a war between his doctrine of types and his interpretation of prophecies?

I would not be understood as disputing against the typical character both of the religion and of the history of the people of the Jews: for I believe both to have been typical; and for this reason, among others, I expect the church to come out of Babylon before Babylon is destroyed; but I remonstrate against the loose style in which the layman speaks of types, and his application of a typical character to God's judgments, which destroys the true doctrine of types as applicable to the whole religion of Moses.

While animadverting on the preliminaries of your correspondent, Mr. Editor, may I not ask, On what authority does he so repeatedly call the Christian church the *Gentile* church? Is not Jerusalem the mother of us all? Were not the first Christians all Jews; and did not the Apostles unite, and make one new body of Jews and Gentiles under Christ? Why, then, regard the Christian church as if exclusively a Gentile thing? Is it to complete your correspondent's doctrine of types, to make way for his demonstration, that, as the Jewish nation fell, so will the Gentile nation, called "the church," come to its close? The slightest inclination of two straight lines will, if they are projected, end in an angle: we had need, then, to be cautious in laying the premises of any argument so pregnant with tremendous consequences as that of our friend. We must not talk loosely of types, facts, reason, and analogy; but proceed with caution, examination, and the assurance of testimony.

Having so far examined the first part of his "Signs of the Times," or what pertains to his analogies and types, and shown, we think, that while these furnish much matter for declamation and fine rhetorical appeals, there is nothing of the certainty of demonstration, logic, or

faith in those chapters of his work—we proceed to his comments upon the prophecies.

In general terms let me observe—

1. That the layman generally, if not always, when in a strait in making out the meaning of prophecy, carries his system across the swamp on the bridge of analogies and types. So that, in fact, all through his interpretations he relies more upon his analogies and types for proof, than on any thing he finds in prophecy.

2. He attributes a much greater amount of ignorance to the priesthood than can possibly be sustained by any written documents. For example, in speaking of *the seals*, he says, (on page 25, in a pamphlet form of his "*Signs of the Times*," which you sent me,) "The most alarming and the most misapplied prophecies in the whole Bible may be found, Rev. vi. 12. to the end. Our priests, almost universally, quote the prophecy as a portrait of the final day." These must be very illiterate priests, indeed; for I know of no learned man, no writer on prophecy, living or dead, that holds the views which our friend M'Corkle imputes almost universally to the priests. Perhaps he only means the *Indiana* priests. Certainly he cannot find any person of note, living or dead, who affirms that the sixth seal alludes to the final consummation. All men of good common sense, and all men of learning, are one in their views of the sixth seal, so far as that it relates to a political or ecclesiastical revolution long before the final consummation. Amongst Catholics themselves there is a very general agreement on this subject, especially since the 12th century. The Abbot Joachim, in the 12th century; Pierre De Olive, in the 13th; Ubertinus De Casalis, in the 14th century, are with Samuel M'Corkle here. So is Dr. Wall, Vitringa, Bishop Newton, Daubuz, Dr. Apthorp, Pyle, Waple, Mede, More, &c. &c. Even the most ancient commentators are of the same opinion; amongst whom are Victorinus, Andrew, and Arthas, whose commentaries on the Revelations are still extant, and who all flourished before the 7th century closed.

3. His comments are sometimes most arbitrary, and so far-fetched and forced, that they are destitute of even plausibility.

4. So much incensed at those who spiritualize away the letter of prophecy, he seems occasionally to run into the opposite extreme, and *literalizes* the spirit of prophecy.

The reasons which compel me to make these general remarks on his performances will appear in the sequel. And though it may at first view appear that we ought to commence with an examination of what he says on *the six seals*, to sustain these exceptions to his treatise;—but, as the finding of fault is not our object, only as it may serve to correct some wrong impressions and to set the whole matter of prophecy in a more intelligible attitude before the student,— we proceed to examine his views of the First Resurrection spoken of in the 20th chapter of the Revelation. This, although almost at the end of the chapter, is so inwrought into the whole commentary before us, that it deservedly occupies our attention first. That there is to be a literal and proper resurrection of certain saints and martyrs a thousand years

antecedent to another literal resurrection, is a matter assumed by all who expect a literal personal return of the Messiah at the destruction of antichrist and the man of sin.*

It is agreed on all hands that the *vision* of the things which were to come to pass subsequent to the times of John's exile, begins with the first verse of the fourth chapter of the Apocalypse, and ends with the seventh verse of the twenty-second chapter. The whole vision, then, occupies eighteen chapters and seven verses. It begins with, "I *saw*, and behold a door opened in heaven;" and ends with, "Blessed is he who keeps the words of the prophecy of this book."—"I, John, *saw* and *heard* these things."

This great vision is composed of several separate and distinct visions in regular succession. Of these the vision of the Book, or Scroll, sealed with seven seals, is first. The opening and development of six of these seals occupies the fourth, fifth, and seventh chapters of the book.

At the opening of the seventh seal there was a solemn pause in heaven for half an hour, and a second vision occupies the prophet—seven angels standing with seven trumpets. These prepare each to sound his blast. The reports or sounds of these seven angels with these trumpets occupy the eighth, ninth, tenth, and eleventh chapters of the book; and if we add the developments attendant on these seven angels, or the separate visions filling up this portion of the prophecy, we are led forward to the close of the fourteenth chapter. But here we have the independent visions of the Two Witnesses—the Woman in heaven clothed with the Sun—a Battle in heaven—a ferocious Beast rising out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns—a Beast ascending out of the earth, having two horns like a lamb, with the tongue of a dragon—the Angel with the sharp sickle.

The third principal vision begins with the fifteenth chapter: seven angels with the seven last plagues—vials of the wrath of God. The pouring out of these vials and all their details extends to the end of the nineteenth chapter. Then follow the vision of the binding of Satan—the First Resurrection—the Millennium—Satan's release from prison—the battle of Gog and Magog—the Final Judgment—the New Heavens and Earth—and the descent of the New Jerusalem.

Now this whole vision, composed of numerous separate visions, gives one prospective view of the destinies of the Christian dispensation till the close of time; but *all of it veiled in figure.* If we take any portion of it literally and other portions of it figuratively, we must have some unequivocal reason or authority for this mode of interpretation, else we destroy the intelligibility of the whole.

Visions are always in figure, and they must be understood figuratively, if understood at all. Concede to one commentator that the first resurrection is a literal resurrection, and you may concede to an-

* Mr. M'Corkle seems to confound "antichrist" with "the man of sin." Here he is not literal enough. John's "antichrists" are either professed apostates, or sceptics; Paul's "man of sin" is a professor of the Christian faith, and sits in the temple of God. This will come in our way more directly at another time.

other that the binding of Satan with a chain is a literal binding, and that Gog and Magog are the literal Gog and Magog of Old Testament history.

It is, indeed, conceded on all hands that some circumstances in a vision must be represented without figure, that it may be intelligible; but these are never the subject matter or principal object in the vision. They are the mere connexions of its parts. We must then object to that system of interpretation which arbitrarily takes as literal the whole of any section of this vision. Such, in our judgment, is the error of our lay brother on the passage under consideration. He represents the principal topic or figure in the vision of the first resurrection as literal with all its attendant circumstances. Hence he deduces a new doctrine not taught by any New Testament author in any of the canonical Scriptures. For it must be confessed that neither Jesus, nor Paul, nor Peter, nor any of the Apostles in their writings ever speak of two literal resurrections; or of a resurrection of some saints a thousand years before others, or before the wicked.

Is not, then, this doctrine of a literal resurrection of the saints to live and reign a thousand years on this earth before another resurrection, to be received with caution? and ought not the single passage in the New Testament on which it rests, or from which it is deduced, to be clear and forcible, to warrant so much confidence as some express on the subject? But is this the fact? No. *It rests wholly on a single figurative passage found in the visions of John*, and that in connexion with the binding of Satan with a great chain, and the insurrections of Gog and Magog around the camp of the saints.

But we may be asked have we any authority from the Bible, Old Testament or New, to speak of a *figurative* resurrection? Yes, of a figurative burial, graves, resurrection, and ascension to heaven. Let those who doubt it read Ezekiel's description of God's people coming up out of their graves:—"O! my people! I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel: and you shall know that I am the Lord when I have opened your graves, O my people, and brought you up out of your graves, and shall put my spirit into you, and you shall live; and I shall place you in your own land." This is only a part of the vision of the resurrection (figurative, indeed,) described by Ezekiel chap. xxxvii.

The Apostle Paul speaks more than once of being buried with Christ, and of being *raised* with him; and on this ground says to the Colossians, "Since you have been *raised* with Christ—ascend—or set your affections on things above." And does not John himself, in the 11th chapter of his vision, speak of the *corpses* of the two witnesses lying *unburied*, and of the *spirit of life entering them*, and of their *ascension* into heaven?

Now, on my friend M'Korkle's doctrine of analogies, may I not ask, If the Jewish church was to have a resurrection out of her graves, may not the Christian church have a similar resurrection? And if the Spirit of life revived the two witnesses, why may it not revive the whole Christian church; and if they ascended up to heaven, may not

the Christian church ascend thither also in the same manner? And if God should put his spirit into the raised Christian church as he promised to do to the house of Israel after he brings them up out of their graves, may not they be said to be blessed and holy who have a part in the first resurrection, as well as the Jews, for whom he displays such power and love?

If Sodom, Egypt, and Babylon, in this scenic representation of things, are said to live again in the corrupt hierarchies of the apostate church, may not the souls of them who were beheaded for the testimony of Jesus—the saints and martyrs of ancient times—be said to live and reign with Christ in the millennial church? And if Christians can figuratively be said now to be crucified with Christ and suffer with him, may they not be said to live and reign with him on earth? How much more easy of conception is this, and how much more in harmony with the figures of this book and with the order of things, than the layman's triumphant church on earth, composed of men and women in the flesh, in company with, or under the government of ancient martyrs and all the saints of olden times. What an incongruous mass will replenish this millennial church! Here are groups of men, women, and children, eating, drinking, sleeping, marrying, and giving in marriage—while Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Paul, Stephen, and John are looking over them (as shepherds tending their flocks) for three hundred thousand years! What pleasure will Elijah, Moses, and Daniel have in the fine corn fields, oliveyards, vineyards, meadows and gardens of that happy period! Will the melody of the groves, and the beauties of spring, summer, and autumn, delight the senses of spiritual and incorruptible bodies, that neither breathe the air nor feast on earthly products! And what, let me again ask, is the scheme or mode of reasoning which gave birth to such a heterogeneous association as that described by the layman on page 40? It is this: Fifteen chapters of the visions of John are understood figuratively, and the three last literally. And why? I cannot say. But he says, "If this resurrection be a figure of Christianity being renovated, there will be a new thing under the sun; and God will not deal with this dispensation as he has formerly done"—that is, it would be contrary to my system of analogies!!

We have much to say on the binding of the dragon—on the first resurrection—and on the insurrections of Gog and Magog, before we finish this topic. We will only add, that I cannot imagine any thing more incongruous than to have one set of saints in a state of trial or probation, and another set who has passed out of that state, living together on our planet, at the same time. A part of those, too, in a state of trial, walking by vision, while another part of the same class at a greater distance from the King, are walking by faith.

If weak thy reason, or thy faith, why, my good brother, choose the harder side?——Have patience with me, as I have had patience with thee.

A REFORMED CLERGYMAN.

For the Millennial Harbinger.

Six Rules for Scripture Interpretation.

THE following excellent rules for Scripture interpretation, are extracted from a "A Discourse on the Nature and Subjects of Christian Baptism. By Moses Hemmenway, D. D., Pastor of a church in Wells." Published in Philadelphia, in 1788, and written by a *Paido-baptist*, in defence of infant *sprinkling*. Had he pursued his own rules, they must have inevitably brought him to different conclusions and inferences than those at which he has arrived, and which he has deduced; but like too many others who are fine *projectors*, he has laid down excellent rules which in *practice* he has abandoned. This was the fault of the great philosopher Bacon. "Lord Bacon pointed out the method of true philosophising; yet, in in practice, he abandoned it, and his own physical investigations may be ranked among the most effectual specimens of that rash and unfounded theorism, which his own principles have banished from the schools of philosophy." For the sake of illustration, I quote the author's text.

Matthew xxviii. 19, 20. *Go ye therefore and teach* (or disciple) *all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. And, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen.*

1. *The scriptures are always to be understood in that sense of the words, which, taken in their connexion, is most natural, plain, obvious, and familiar to us, and those for whose instruction they were primarily designed. The literal sense is always to be preferred to a figurative one, unless there appear plain and good reasons to the contrary.* For instance, though the word baptize in our text is sometimes taken in a figurative sense, for the giving of the Holy Spirit; yet as it literally and primarily signifies a washing in water, and this sense was most obvious and familiar to the Apostles, and is so to us, and the word commonly bears this sense in the New Testament, and there appears no incongruity with the context, or inconsistency with other parts of the scriptures, in understanding it thus in this place; we therefore conclude, that it is a literal and water baptism that is here intended. On the contrary, when Christ tells his Apostles, "I am with you to the end of the world," we cannot understand the words literally of his bodily presence. For, as the Apostles were to disperse into different and remote parts of the world, it was impossible that Christ should be always with them bodily. And besides, he was immediately to ascend to, and remain in heaven, till the end of the world. This must therefore be understood figuratively, of those gracious assistances which he would afford to them.

2. *The scripture is the best and surest interpreter of Scripture, and if the meaning of any word or phrase seems doubtful, we must compare it with other places, where a like expression is used, or where the same subject is treated of perhaps in plainer language, and that inter*

pretation is to be adhered to, which is most consonant to the general language and doctrine of the Scriptures themselves. Thus the word Baptize, in our text, may be compared with, and explained by the words of the Apostle, in which he says, "That the church is sanctified by the washing of water with the word:" whence we are to conclude that water Baptism is a gospel ordinance; and that Baptism signifies a washing.

3. *The Scriptures are to be understood as containing not only those truths which are expressly asserted, but also those which are plainly implied.* For example, it is not expressly asserted in our text, that baptism is to be a standing ordinance in the church to the end of the world. But then, as Christ has promised to be with his ministers in the execution of their commission to the end of the world; and as they were in this their commission instructed to baptize, as well as teach; it is a fair consequence, that the duties, as well as the encouragements contained in their commission, were to continue to the end of time; and so baptism is a standing ordinance.—And that this is the true meaning, implied, though not expressed.

4. *That is the true sense of Scripture which best agrees with the original text.* Though the scriptures were written in Hebrew and Greek, by divine inspiration, yet they were not *translated* by divine inspiration. Some words are not exactly translated; and are to be corrected by the original. Our text, I think, is an example.—This clause, "Go teach all nations," ought rather to be understood, "Go make all nations disciples;" for so the Greek word properly signifies. To teach or indoctrinate is expressed by another word which we have in the latter verse of our text: "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded."

5. *That interpretation of Scripture is to be adhered to, which gives the best, aptest, and most instructive sense to the words: unless it should appear that a different sense was intended.* Thus, for example. I think it makes better sense to read our text according to the amendment proposed; "Go make all nations disciples; baptizing and teaching them," &c.; than to read it according to our translation, "Go teach all nations; baptizing them——teaching them;" where the repetition of the word "teach" seems needless and uninstructive.

6. *The practice of the primitive church, so far as it is known, is to be attended to, in case doubts should arise concerning the meaning and proper administration of gospel ordinances.* The meaning of precept, is sometimes cleared and ascertained by authentic precedents. And we have no precedents which are so much to be regarded by us, as the practice of the church in its earliest and purest state; especially in the apostolic age. For example: in our text, baptism with water is not expressly mentioned; but we know that in the apostolic and primitive church, baptism with water was practised: which seems to put the matter out of all reasonable doubt, that it is a water baptism that is here intended.

R. H.

Translations.

THERE is no commentator, theologian, critic, or man of letters, who has paid much attention to the common English version, who does not say that it needs correction and emendation. But how this is to be accomplished, is a puzzle to them all. We shall occasionally give them a hearing on this matter. Thomas Smith Grimke, well known in the literary world, as an eloquent pleader for the Bible—and a warm admirer of the King's version—after pronouncing a highly wrought encomium upon it, suggests the following plan of correcting its errors, and improving its defects in style. Ed.

I trust that I may be pardoned for intruding on the peculiar province of the Divine, by suggesting a scheme for making the present translation more perfect. It is agreed among Protestants, that our English Bible admits of improvement, arising from a better knowledge of Hebrew and the other Oriental Languages, of ancient Eastern history, geography, manners and customs, and from a more extensive and accurate acquaintance with all the departments of Sacred Literature. The various able commentators of different denominations have pointed out, from time to time, the amendments, which they have thought desirable. *I regard the English Bible, as the Religious Constitution of Protestant America.* Why then may not a plan of this kind be acted on, a plan bearing some analogy to the scheme for the amendment of the Constitution of the United States? Let any one of the various Theological Institutions of our country, propose to every other, such alterations, as may appear to the Seminary suggesting them, to be desirable. If *any one* of the proposed changes be disapproved by *any one* of *all* the other Divinity Colleges, let it be considered as rejected. But, if *any one* of the amendments offered be accepted by *all the other* Institutions, let it then be regarded as adopted by them. This step being taken by the preparatory tribunals, let the amendment then be proposed to the highest ecclesiastical body of *each* denomination, such as the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, &c. If agreed to by all, let it then be considered as an admissible change, in any edition of the English Bible, that may be afterwards published by any of those denominations, or by the American Bible Society. If no amendments be proposed, but such as are free from sectarian difficulties; and if the whole matter be conducted in a truly Christian, Protestant, American spirit; in the spirit of Christian love, of Protestant freedom, and American fellowship; as servants of the same Heavenly Master, as children of the same glorious Reformation, as brothers of the same national family, I cannot doubt, that much good would flow from the plan proposed.

To look to England for any change in the present version of the English Bible, is out of the question. The relative situation of the Established and Dissenting Churches, is sufficient to satisfy any one, that while it subsists, there can be no agreement, even on such points

as a reformation of the present English Bible, in matters not sectarian. We must, therefore, judge and act for ourselves; and as unquestionably the changes, that might be adopted in this country, would be sanctioned, for the most part, if not altogether, by the best English and Scotch commentators, we may indulge the hope that we might thus be instrumental in preparing the way in Great Britain, for an amendment of King James' Bible among themselves.

A Good Library.

I HAVE not found any writer who more fully expresses my views of the present fashionable collegiate course, than the aforesaid Mr. Grimke, nor any with whom I more generally agree on all questions of literature. With a very few subtractions and additions, I would recommend his list of authors, as comprising one of the best selections which could have been made twenty years ago. I would recommend them to the student, as a substitute for those which now generally crowd the shelves of the college libraries. But if a youth wishes to be a good and great man, let him daily study the Bible alone for religion and morality, and nature for philosophy: let him think two hours for every hour he reads; and pay attention to all that passes before him. Reading makes an intelligent man—writing a correct man—conversation a fluent man,—but it is thinking that makes a great man—as some person has said. Ed.

I believe, that I do not speak unadvisedly or ignorantly, on this subject. I have devoted as much time to the study of the classics, and with as much zeal and industry, as perhaps most scholars of our country, excepting Professors and other teachers. I began life with deep feelings of veneration for the classics, with an exalted opinion of their excellence in matter and manner, and with a strong belief of their superiority over the Moderns. But the reflections and experience of twenty years have led me gradually, yet irresistibly against all my prepossessions and settled opinions, to the conclusion, that the best interests of education in this country, require a total revolution on this subject. For myself, I hope to be excused for setting down here, candidly and independently, the result of much and anxious thought, devoted to this inquiry, especially whilst engaged in the education of my eldest son. Confining the question to British authors only, as compared with those of Greece and Rome, my settled opinion is, that the former are superior to the latter, in all the constituent excellencies of true greatness; in permanent, practical, extensive usefulness; in preparing the individual for the walks of private and social life; the citizen, for the rational enjoyment of his privileges; the patriot, for his public duties; and the Christian, for the service of his God, and of his fellow men. Accordingly, I would rather have a young man deeply imbued with the spirit, thoroughly instructed in the principles, and enriched with the knowledge, to be gathered from the eminent authors of the British school, than that

he should be the most accomplished classical scholar in the Union, nay, even in the world. I would rather he should be a profound student of the Philosophy, Literature, and History, produced by the British Isles, than that he should copy Thucydides nine times, or imitate Dudith, in transcribing Cicero thrice;* that he should be able to converse like Ritterhusius, in the lines of Homer, or commit, like Lipsius, the whole of Tacitus to memory. Let a young man study, with enthusiasm and devoted application, the following authors, and I feel assured, that he will be a wiser and better, a more useful and happy man, whether in public or private life, than if he should dedicate the prime of his days to the classics, and be able to write Greek like Heinsius, or Latin like Muretus.† The English authors, whom I would name as constituting a nobler, richer, and more valuable library, than the whole body of Greek and Roman writers together, are the following. I exclude from the catalogue literary writers, such as Novelists and Poets; not, however, that I undervalue them. Indeed, I regard the British Isles, as the superiors of Greece and Rome, in the sublime and the beautiful, in the descriptive and the pathetic, in the moral and sentimental Poetry. And as to the writings of Scott and Radcliffe, of Fielding, Smollet, Richardson, Godwin, &c., &c., they have no rivals in the whole compass of ancient Literature. For no one, I presume, would compare with them, "the loves of Chæreas and Callirhoe," or of "Clitophon and Leucippe;" "the Amours of Daphnis and Chloe," or of "Dosicles and Rhodanthe;" the Romances of Zenophon and Parthenius, or the Æthiopics of the Bishop of Tricca. Fictitious History, in truth, is found among the ancients, only in the state of a raw material. The profound knowledge of human nature, the original genius, and exquisite workmanship of British artists, have added another order to the Architecture of Literature.

---

* Were instructors, in our day, to recommend an imitation of this example of the Athenian Orator, it would be considered as *downright folly*. If the Student of Divinity were told to copy Butler's Analogy; the Student of Law, Blackstone's Commentaries; the Student of Belles Lettres, Kaimes or Alison; and the Student of Philosophy, Paley or Locke, it would be pronounced an unpardonable waste of time, and a very unintelligible mode of improvement. Does not this act of Demosthenes very remarkably illustrate the fundamental difference, between the Ancients and Moderns, that the former regarded *style* as an *end;* but the latter, as a *means:* that the former excel CHIEFLY in *style*, the latter PRE-EMINENTLY in *thought*. If Demosthenes had not copied Thucydides, Dudith would have been ridiculed and despised as a laborious trifler, destitute of taste, discrimination and judgment. But he may now silence all classical scholars, with Cicero's memorable sentiment; "errare mehercule cum Platone malo, quam cum istis vera sentire;" unless, indeed, one of them should have the courage to return, as a just rebuke, the sentiment of Cicero himself: there is nothing *so absurd*, but that some one or other of the Philosophers has advanced it.

† I mention the Greek of Heinsius, because his Greek Poem (Pandora, I think,) passed with Scaliger for the work of Hesiod; and Muretus imposed on the same celebrated critic, Latin verses of his own composition, as fragments of Trabeas.

The following is the list of books referred to.

The Bible with Scott's, or Henry's, or D'Oyley and Mant's, and A. Clarke's Commentaries. Paley's Evidences. Chalmer's Evidences. Butler's Analogy. Cumberland on the Laws of Nature. Campbell on Miracles. Horseley's nine Sermons on do. Horseley's Discourse on Prophesies among the heathen as to the Messiah. Dwight's Theology. Good's Book of Nature. Paley's Natural Theology. Magee on the Atonement. Horæ Mosaicæ by Faber. Horæ Paulinæ by Paley. Blackwell's Sacred Classics. Lowth's Lectures on Hebrew Poetry. Good's Book of Job. Horseley's Psalms. Horseley's Hosea. Robert Lowth's Isaiah. Horne's Critical Study of the Scriptures. Berkeley's Minute Philosopher. Law's considerations of Natural and Revealed Religion. Neal's History of the Puritans. God's End in the Creation of the World, by the Elder Edwards. Beattie on Truth. Smith's Moral Sentiments. Paley's Moral Philosophy. Foster's Essays. Locke's Essay. Dugald Stewart. Edwards on the Will. Kirwan's Logic. Watts on the Improvement of the Mind. Enfield's History of Philosophy. Reid. Brown. Bacon's Advancement of Learning. Blair's Lectures. Campbell's Philosophy of Rhetoric. Alison on Taste. Kames' Elements. Murray's Grammar 8vo. Horne Tooke's Diversions of Purley. Ferguson on Civil Society. Stuart's view of Society in Europe. Hallam's Middle Ages. Robertson's India. Playfair's Decline and Fall of Nations. Burke and MackIntosh on Fr. Revol. Madame de Stael on do. Burke's Letters on a Regicide Peace. Rutherforth. Smith's Wealth of Nations. Malthus on Population. Brougham's Colonial Policy. Alexander Hamilton's Reports. De Lolme on the English Government.* Millar on do. Montague's Ancient Republics. Hallam's Constitutional History of England. Chipman's Principles. Nile's Principles and Acts of the Revolution. The Federalist. Chancellor Kent's Lectures on Constitutional Law. Principal Decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. Best Speeches of American Statesmen and Lawyers. Best do. of English, as Chatham, Pitt, Fox, Windham, Erskine, Burke, Sheridan, Canning, Brougham, MackIntosh. Brown's Antiquties of the Jews. Milman's History of the Jews. Russell's Ancient Europe. Mitford's Greece. Leland's Philip. Gillie's History of the World from Alexander to Augustus. Shuckford's Connexions. Russell's Continuation. Prideaux's Connexions. History of Rome under the Kings, from Hooke. Ferguson's Roman Republic. Gibbon's Decline and Fall. Milner's History of the Christian Church. Russell's Modern Europe. Roscoe's

* I number De Lolme among English writers; because, although a Swiss, he never could have written his work, had he not become an inhabitant of England. Without a permanent residence, he would have been as little fit for the task, as Montesquieu, or as Mably was to write, respecting the Constitution of the United States. I mention several American writers likewise, as identified with English Literature, in relation to the rest of the world, especially as to the Ancients.

Leo X. Robertson's Charles V. Watson's Philip II, and III. Irving's Columbus. Robertson's America. Marshall's Washington. Pitkin's Civil and Political History of the United States. Hume's History of England, with the continuations. Brodie's History of England, correcting Hume's errors. Clarendon's History of the Rebellion. Cox's Life of Marlborough. Gifford's Life of Pitt. Priestley's Lectures on History. Bolingbroke on History. Do. on English History. Gray's Memoria Technica. And lastly, the various and general knowledge, found in Cyclopædias, and the admirable articles on Politics, Philosophy, and Criticism, in the Edinburgh and Quarterly Reviews.

It is an error to suppose, that a course of study is confined to the period of *youth*, and that when a young man has left school or college, he has finished his education, and has nothing to study, but his profession. In truth, he has done little more than treasure up some of the important materials, and acquire the elementary habits and discipline, which are indispensable to the continued improvement of his mind. If he expects to be a scholar, not in the *Literary* sense of the word, but in a far higher and nobler sense, as a Christian, Patriot, Philanthropist, and Public Servant, in the State or National Councils, in Literary, Benevolent, and Religious Institutions; if he means to be distinguished for his sense of duty, and his spirit of usefulness, for just principles, enlarged views, dignified sentiments, and liberal feelings, for sound thinking, and clear, close reasoning, let him be assured that he has done little more than lay the foundations, in the school, or even in the college, up to the age of twenty. He must make up his mind to be a devoted student, in spite of his professional engagements, for ten years at least; until he shall have been able to deepen and strengthen, and enlarge, and elevate his mind, so as to fit himself for solid, honorable, permanent usefulness. Let him remember, that the *School* only prepares the *youth* to enter on the course of study, appropriate to the *young man:* and that the *College* only enables the *young man* to enter on the course of study, appropriate to the *man. Manhood has its appropriate course of study*, and the difference between men arises very much from their selection and pursuit of a right course of study. Many fine minds, capable of enlarged and durable improvement and usefulness, are lost every year to the community, in which their lot is cast, to the country they are bound to serve, to the cause of religion, humanity, justice and literature: *because they have failed in this great duty, they have neglected the course of study, appropriate to manhood.* And here let it be remarked, that the *true* student never considers how much he reads, but rather how *little*, and only *what*, and *how* he reads.

Methodistic Episcopacy.

[CONTINUED.]

THE *form* of government gives a name to the State. Is it a kingly government? then the state is called a Kingdom. Does an em-

peror preside? then it is an Empire. Do the nobles rule? then it is an Aristocracy. Do the people reign? then it is a Republic or a Democracy. In the Church the same rule obtains. Is there a pope in the constitution? then it is Papacy. Are the bishops the government? then it is Episcopacy. Do the elders rule? then it is Presbyterian. Have the people a voice in all matters? then it is Congregational.

The Episcopal Methodists regard the form of government as so essential, that they affix it to their name, and while they make the name *Methodist* distinguish them from protestants in general; they make the name *Episcopal* distinguish them from all other Methodists. Be their opinions what they may, they practically sustain *Episcopal* Methodism.

To finish my demonstration commenced in my last paper, it is necessary to trace the lineage of their episcopacy, and see how far it justifies me in the allegation, that it is the third in discent from the Roman hierarchy. The bishops of Rome are not elected by the people, but by the clergy; they are not amenable to the people, but to the clergy; the people have no more power over the bishops, than they have over the pope of Rome. But they have absolute power over the people.

In England, down to the reign of Edward the Sixth, the bishops were created by a Conge d' elire, which was a sort of election not so real as your conferences, Mr. Waterman; for while theirs was but the shadow of an election, yours is a real clerical ballot. So far the grand-daughter has reformed from the habits of the grand-mother.

But an act of parliament was passed early in the reign of Edward the Sixth, if I remember right, in 1547 or 1548, that the bishops of England should be appointed by the king's letters patent, only: Cranmer himself, resigned his office of "General Superintendent" or archbishop, under the statute, till he got a new commission from the king. The first royal patent bishop was commissioned Feb. 3d, 1548. This was the celebrated Dr. Barlow, bishop of Bath and Wells. All the bishops of England followed his example, and took out patents from the king, with this clause, "He shall continue the exercise of his jurisdiction during his natural life, if he behave well."—In this you have reformed; for although your first American bishop was made by letters patent from John Wesley, you now elect them by a vote of conference for life or good behaviour.

But here it becomes necessary for me to open your present discipline; for your ecclesiastical govern ment has undergone various important changes since Bishop Asbury attempted to alienate the American Methodists from John Wesley. I need not refer you to the minutes of 1787, 1788, and 1789, but to those of 1829. The question in the minutes of 1787 reads thus—"Who are the *superintendants* of our church?" In the discipline of 1788, it reads—"Who are the *bishops* of our church?" and in the minutes for 1789, the question is asked and answered in the following words—"Who are the persons that exercise the episcopal office in the Methodist church in Europe

and America?" Answer: "John Wesley, Thomas Coke, Francis Asbury, by regular order and succession."—By *succession?*—! Whom did John Wesley *succeed?*—The Latins say, "Nihil dat, quod non habit." And we say, No person can give what he has not got.

But we go to the present discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, published in 1829, to ascertain the mode of creating an American Episcopal Methodist bishop, and in the next place to define his powers.

On page 24, the question is asked—"How is a bishop to be constituted?" It is answered in the words following, to wit:—"By the election of the *general conference*, and the laying on of the *hands of three bishops*, or at least of one bishop and two elders."

The General Conference meets only once in four years, and is composed of one preacher for every seven preachers in the seventeen annual conferences, who is appointed either by seniority or choice at the discretion of each annual conference; but no preacher is eligible to the honor of membership in the general conference, who is not of good character, and who has not travelled *four* years since he was received on trial by an annual conference. Over this general conference one of the bishops must preside, if present. Bishops then, are made only by general conferences once every four years, as above described—by election of elect clergyman, and by consecration by the imposition of bishop's hands, or in extreme cases by the hands of one bishop and two elect elders.

The *duties* of the bishop next demand attention. We shall quote from page 25.

"*Quest.* 3. What are the duties of a bishop?

Answ. 1. To preside in our conferences.

2. To fix the appointments of the preachers for the several circuits, provided he shall not allow any preacher to remain in the same station more than two years successively; except the presiding elders, the editor and general book steward, the assistant editor and general book steward, the editor of the Christian Advocate and Journal, the supernumerary, superannuated and worn out preaches, missionaries among the Indians, those preachers that may be appointed to labor for the special benefit of seamen, also the preacher or preachers that may be stationed in the city of New Orleans, and the presidents, principals, or teachers of seminaries of learning, which are or may be under our superintendence.

3. In the intervals of the conferences, to change, receive, and suspend preachers, as necessity may require, and as the discipline directs.

4. To travel through the connexion at large.

5. To oversee the spiritual and temporal business of our church.

6. To ordain bishops, elders, and deacons."

These duties embrace all that devolves on the bishops of England by virtue of their ecclesiastical dignity, save a seat in the house of Lords. Things may not always be called by the same names, though they are the same things. We may have the word *district*

for *diocess, circuit* for *parish, circuit preacher* for *curate, presiding elder* for *rector*, and *conference* for *council;* and the attributes and functions, and powers and duties, the same.

To atone for the want of a seat in the house of Lords, the Methodist bishops have the supervision of the temporal affairs of the whole Methodist Episcopal church, and are invested with more power than the Episcopalian bishops in America; and, indeed, though inferior in dignity, not having patents from the king, nor a seat in the house of Lords temporal, they are superior in ecclesiastic authority to the twenty-four bishops of Old England, and are more on a footing with the Archbishops of York and Canterbury; for when John Wesley commissioned "*two general superintendents*" over all the American Methodists, he modeled much more after these two general superintendents of the Sees of York and Canterbury, than after the ordinary diocessan prelates of England.

It is a curious question, but not without a moral on human nature; —if Carthage had conquered Rome, and not Rome, Carthage, what would have been the present condition of the world? Equally curious and instructive the question, had John Wesley been a presbyterian and not an episcopalian, what would have been the present state of the Methodist church in England and America!—As it is, however, I can affirm, I never saw a daughter that did more honor to her mother's face, in giving a fair and full expression of all its features, than does the Methodist Episcopal government, honor that of the English hierarchy.

Let us now enumerate the powers of your bishops, Friend Waterman, in spirituals and temporals. They have the presidency of the conferences, and can negative or veto all their proceedings. They have the absolute right of fixing the appointments for the several circuits. They alone choose presiding elders, station and change them according to their own sovereign will and pleasure. They ordain the deacons and elders, and during the recess of conference, can "change, receive, and suspend preachers as necessity may require, and as its discipline may direct." The bishop must sign every draft upon your chartered fund, to make it payable to order: as president of the General Conference, he controls the press of the whole society; and, if I am correctly informed, he virtually carries the keys of all your meeting-houses and colleges. He is responsible only to the General Conference for improper conduct, but this same conference invests him with authority, to act as bishop in all things over the whole connexion as he thinks best: and how can that body in a legal way chastise him for using the authority which it has given him!

In ordaining all the inferior clergy, before he lays his hands upon them, he solemnly binds them "*reverently*" to obey him in the words following, to wit: "Will you reverently obey your chief ministers, unto whom is committed the charge and government over you, following with a glad mind and will, their godly admonitions, submitting yourselves to their godly judgments?" Answer: "I will do so, the Lord being my helper."

You, knowing all these things, which I have learned from your own authorized works, ask me to inform myself better on the subject of your *opinions* about the mode of ordination, and would have the public to believe, that the Episcopal Methodists are under the most pliant and genial government in the world, free from the least resemblance to the Old Lady; the very paragon of all charity, liberality, moderation, and republican excellency!! If I feard not the reproach of being again called "the *accuser*" of the Methodist brotherhood, I would ask you,—Is there on earth, out of the old city Rome, a more concentrated despotism over the conscience, persons, and property of any religious community, than is found in Methodistic Episcopacy? Now if there be; pray tell me where I shall find the history of it.

Have I not as much power in your conferences, as much to do in choosing your pastors and rulers, as any class or society in your widely extended community? The Methodist people never made any part of their government, any more than the present Catholics living in Louisiana, made the present pope of Rome. The books which they read, the sermons which they hear, are prescribed to them by persons, whom neither they nor their fathers elected or appointed to this episcopacy. Your bishops say to those who have first promised reverently to obey them, when laying their hands on them,—"*take thou authority* to execute the office of deacon, (or elder, as the case may be:) in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen!"

The bishops *give*, and the ordained *take* authority in the name, &c. And who gave to the bishops this authority? The bishops can create and they can destroy—but who created them? Does their creator dwell in heaven or on earth? They create the deacon, the elder, the presiding elder, and the conference,—but who created them? The creatures of their own formation!!—Nay, indeed, John Wesley created the first pair, and placed them in the American Garden, to multiply and replenish the earth and to subdue it: but who created John?—Not the bishop of London, for he refused to help John to make one bishop; and what comes of "the order and succession" of John Wesley!

I know indeed, that men of sense among the Methodist clergy, like yourself, say that the whole of this matter is worth nothing—that the modes of ordination and succession are all nothing, and less than nothing; but what says your *practice?* You know it cannot be defended; and therefore, your title not being valid according to the laws of heaven or earth, it is prudence for you to say, that mode and succession are nothing. This is good policy; you only aim at being at par with other societies; and to effect this, you have only to reduce them to the same uncertainty, and to invalidate their claims to a divine order, or a constitutional succession. You understand that taking a foot from the stature of C, will be equal to adding a foot to the stature of W, and very prudently turn the whole matter of church

order into a jest; and gravely inform us, that all forms are alike excellent, and alike patronized by Heaven!

In justice to your discipline, (for I do not wish to give a wrong view of a single word of it,) I must add, that you have a way of desecrating a bishop, if he should act wickedly. "If he be accused of immorality, *three travelling elders* shall call upon him, and examine him upon the subject; and if the three elders verily believe that the bishop is guilty of the crime, (but if only two of them, *what then?*) they shall call to their aid, two presiding elders from two districts in the neighborhood of that where the crime was committed, each of which presiding elders shall bring with him two elders, or a deacon:" (but no layman.) The above mentioned *nine* persons, (creatures, perhaps all of them, of the accused,) shall form a conference, to examine into the charge brought against the bishop; "and if *two* thirds of them (why not *five* out of *nine?*) believe him to be guilty of the crime laid to his charge, they shall have authority to suspend the bishop, till the ensuing general conference:" p 26. This appears to me, as it did to a good old Methodist some years since, like trying a Virginia Sheriff by his own deputies. I do not think that the Methodists in Brooke county, Virginia, would consent, that should the High Sheriff of this county become a public defaulter, he should be tried by no other court than one composed of his own deputies. Let the Methodists take care of their bishops, if they can: for the clergy have committed them into their hands, body, soul, and spirit, as respects their ecclesiastical existence. America has no men standing upon its soil, who possess so great and so varied authority, as the present dynasty of the Methodist Episcopal church. If then, the dispensation of the ordinances of preaching, baptizing, feeding the church &c. &c., by an order or succession purporting to be derived from Rome or London, whether in pretence or in reality, it be so derived; be one of the family attributes of the Mother of Harlots, as is on all hands agreed; have I not unequivocally proved that the Methodist Episcopal church is the third in descent from the Scarlet Lady, who occasionally rides upon a sea monster, having seven heads and ten horns?

If these documents and reasonings are inconclusive in the good sense of my friend Waterman, I will only say, that the history of Methodism, imperfectly as I am in possession of it, will afford me other documents, perhaps more satisfactory than those I have now selected. And they shall be forthcoming, if necessary.

EDITOR.

Conscience.

Alumnus not having finished his essays on Conscience,—in order to rouse him to diligence, and to elicit more light on the subject, we publish the following communication, received about two weeks since. ED.

For the Millennial Harbinger.

Mr. A. Campbell.

Dear Sir:—I notice an article in No. 6. of the current volume of the Millennial Harbinger, headed "Concience—No. 3," and signed, "Alumnus." As this piece contains sentiments which appear to me erroneous, I offer a few remarks. In the first place, I will state some of my own opinions; and then make some brief strictures on those of "Alumnus."

Conscience is the faculty of discriminating between *moral* good and evil. From it, arises the accountability of our nature; for how should we be held accountable for choosing that which is evil, if unable to discern and prefer the good. It is the same in all men. It may indeed be perverted and warped by the accidents of ignorance, interest, and prejudice; but it is nevertheless in its nature and functions, the same in all. There is an immutable difference between moral right and wrong; and of necessity, the faculty which discriminates between them, must be invariable and unchangeable.

Conscience is an innate and original faculty of the mind. It is capable of distinguishing between moral good and evil, by a power superior to all reasoning—an intuitive and unerring perception.

Even Revelation itself, must be submitted to its approval or rejection; else we should be bound to receive the Koran, Shaster, and all writings making such pretensions, as divine revelation, with the Bible; for it is chiefly because the latter "commends itself to every man's conscience," by its moral purity and perfection, that it is our duty to receive it as the oracles of God.

I cannot avoid deploring the lightness with which "Alumnus" treats all investigations, concerning what he calls "the origin of conscience." He is frightened at the "metaphysical obscurity" of this subject; and is utterly averse to an "examination of the powers and attributes of mind," and "its mysterious essence." But it would seem to me, if there is one branch of human knowledge more worthy of attention than another, it is this. Second only in importance to the study of the character and attributes of that mysterious and glorious Being, who created the mind in his own likeness, and nearly connected with it, is the study of our own spiritual being. But to "Alumnus," this important and most interesting subject suggests no other ideas than those of a voyage to "the mountains of the Moon," to "Saturn's ring," or the unexplored territories of "the distant Herschel." His reason for eschewing an "examination into the origin of conscience," is truly a remarkable one. Speaking of the different and contradictory opinions which have prevailed on this subject, he says, "that all these different conclusions cannot be true, is evident; and since error is not better than ignorance, it might have been as well to have left the subject wholly unexamined."!! With precisely the same propriety might he have said, "that since theologians have differed, and of course some of them erred, on the subject of religion, 'it might have been as well, to have left the subject wholly unexamined.'"

After disposing in a summary and somewhat satisfactory manner of several erroneous hypotheses, he introduces his own; which I am constrained to consider the least defensible of all.

"Conscience," he tell us, or rather, says after Mr. Locke, "is the power of judging of the moral rectitude or pravity of our own actions;" and on this he founds his hypothesis, that conscience "*is only a peculiar exercise or application of the faculty of judgment.*"

Thus he even transcends his master, Locke, in error, who confines the province of conscience to *morals;* whereas, "Alumnus" makes it the judge of things, in their nature indifferent, as far as morals are concerned; and the more effectually to degrade it from its dignity as a *moral* faculty, he avers it is possessed by the brutes!

If it be true, that conscience is merely "a peculiar exercise of the judgment," how happens it, that some persons whose judgment is very weak and contemptible, possess the moral sense in a high degree; and others, whose judgments are of a high order, are little troubled with the compunctious visitings of conscience? But if "Alumnus" makes it a faculty which we possess in common with the irrational creation, I confess I have little more to say.

One or two remarks farther, and I shall take my leave of him.

He says, "We are no sooner provided with a standard by which to judge, than we are unavoidably compelled to justify or condemn," &c. What standard? and how is it to be provided? Some information on this head would have been very gratifying, but "Alumnus" has not seen fit to impart it. He goes on to say, that conscience "exists before education—before knowledge—even before the standard by which it judges; for it is obvious, that it must first judge the standard itself, by which its future decisions are to be regulated." By what *standard* does it judge *this* standard? And how does it acquire the first one? Really, this doctrine manifests a striking and rather a ludicrous likeness to the atheistical one; of the eternal series of men. But he explains. "So soon, then, as the mind is presented with principles upon which a standard can be erected, so soon does conscience begin to exercise its powers." I am inclined to infer from this passage, that "Alumnus" suddenly recovered from the strong aversion to "metaphysical obscurity," under which he so lately labored. Meanwhile, I must suspend my strictures on his essay, till he informs us what he means, by "presenting the mind with principles," and erecting a standard upon them, by which conscience can regulate its operations.

Conscience is, in my opinion, a faculty entirely distinct from the judgment. The latter pronounces on the expediency and practical usefulness of things and actions, and on the adaptation of means to ends. The province of the former, is entirely confined to subjects of a moral nature; and when these are presented to the mind, it distinguishes the right from the wrong, in a voice which we cannot smother, and which it is our highest interest to obey.

An expression of your own sentiments on this subject, would greatly oblige more than, Your ob,t servant, VINDEX.

WHEATLAND, N. Y., August 1834.

Reformation---No. 1.

IN THE FORM OF DESULTORY REMARKS.

LEAVING the first principles and the theory of Christianity, let us proceed to perfection. And what is the perfection of Christianity, as it respects life and character, but a godly behaviour? An enlightened understanding, a pure heart, and a holy life,—are the native fruits of the Gospel. The gospel is the bright shining of the Divine philanthropy, irradiating the understanding, warming the heart, refining the affections, and giving a moral lustre to the temper, discourse, and demeanor of man. It plants the seeds of celestial goodness, righteousness, and truth, in the heart which blossom and bear fruit in the word and actions of the regenerate.

Conversion in ancient times, was not a change of creeds or systems—it was not a fit of passion or feeling—a sudden transition of thought,—but a translation from darkness to light, from the power of Satan to God,—a change of heart, state, and character. The converted were children of light—walked in the light—wrought righteousness—lived soberly, righteously, and godly in this world. But what are the fruits of our modern gospels,—the conversions of a sectarian age? Are they generally distinguished (for we speak of the majority) for a heavenly temper, for a moral deportment, for a devout life! Is the promise of a christian, generally as good as the bond of an infidel? Is punctuality, justice, or fair dealing, characteristic of the christian profession? We ask not for the piety of the convert, but for his morality. For whatever plausibility there may be in supposing the existence of morality without piety, there is not the least pretence for piety without morality. There is no greater abuse of words, than to call a bargain-breaker, a liar, a thief, a violator of a promise or a pledge; a christian. Did Jesus Christ teach or practice any thing of this sort? It is most revolting to our feelings, to ask such a question. And had not our acquaintance with professors assured us, that there are many whose promises are as faithless as Satan, whose contracts and covenants are made to be broken, except when interest binds them, whose word and sealed promise, are not worth five dollars,—I should not have put such a question. But injustice and unrighteousness head the long catalogue of crimes, which call to heaven for vengeance on this apostate generation.

'Sir,' said a preacher to a sceptic, 'why do you not join the church of Christ?' 'Where is it?' replied the sceptic. 'Here,' said the preacher, pointing to a congregation which had just been celebrating a communion season. 'Do you call these the church of *Christ?*' answered the free-thinker. 'I do, sir,' responded the preacher: 'I heard many of them relate their experience; and I doubt not their genuine conversion to God.' 'I thought,' continued the man of doubts, 'that Christ taught his followers to keep their promises, to be just, and honest, and love one another.' 'And will you

insinuate,' said the preacher, in an angry tone, 'that these professors are not men of truth, justice, and integrity?' 'Of them, sir,' rejoined the sceptic, 'I know but little; but, sir, I know a congregation with whom these people are in fellowship, as you call it; and about two months since, I was present at their communion season. I was, sir, a merchant for four years in that village, and this gave me an opportunity of knowing them all pretty well: and while they were handing to each other the bread and wine, I was thinking of their circumventions and rascalities, as I call them, which they used to practice upon each other, and the other citizens of that neighborhood. The two deacons that handed them the bread and wine, were both insolvent to the amount of six or seven thousand dollars each; and by a cunning manœuvre in law, held the property of their creditors, and fared sumptuously every day;—while a number of the members partaking with them, who frequently complained to me of their proceedings, have so often violated their pledged word to me, that I had at last to refuse them credit, and sue them at law for their accounts. But this was not the worst of it: for before the 'squire, two of them, the greatest talkers in the church, sought to disprove certain charges against them, by the testimony of their own children and relations; which I set aside by my clerk, to the full satisfaction of the justice, and obtained judgment in both cases. And such talking and backbiting I never heard in any society, as was practised by the members of that church. Now, sir, if I joined your church, would I not have to fellowship with that church; for you call it a church of *Christ* too?' The preacher changed the subject of conversation, by saying, 'Ah, sir! they are not all Israel, who are of Israel:'—'The tares and wheat must grow together till harvest.'—

Miracles and Apostles could not sustain the cause of Christianity in the world, while the majority of professors are worse than infidels in their morality. And while Europe and America are filled with wars, and frauds, and tyranny, slavery, and oppression, with all injustice, and unrighteousness, their missionaries to foreign lands and at home, can achieve nothing, or next to nothing. But we are called *reformers;* and would to God, we may be found not merely reformers of false theories, but of false practices.

Let moral actions rather than abstract opinions, be principal subjects of discussion; and let the reins of discipline be drawn more and more closely, till the disciples be elevated to the standard of christian morality, as it is taught and enforced in the New Testament. "One sinner," said Solomon, "destroys much good." An immoral disciple is a pest to any Christian society. His behaviour will neutralize the influence of the most convincing discourse, and make void the best efforts of the most successful proclaimer of the Word. Not only this, but the good order of the congregation will lose all its charms and power on the unconverted. An alien in the camp, will disturb the peace and prosperity of the whole church.

The rage for increasing parties, has filled many churches with a mass of ignorance and corruption, that must sink the cause for ever,

in numerous instances. This is one of the curses of rival ecclesiastical establishments. From the spirit of competition, thousands are kept on the rolls, for the mere sake of arithmetical numbers. God forbid that ever this spirit or policy should ever possess the disciples, who now sustain the cause of reformation. Better purge out the old leaven—abhor this policy, and let it be your boast, that your brethren are just men; that all your Father's children love truth, speak truth; that the promises of a disciple are yea and amen,—never to be broken. What an honor to society, that the promise of a member is better than a bond with security. That promises and contracts may be held sacred, let them be made with proper conditions, and with all deliberation and calculations on contingences. It would be a libel on reformation, to have reformers no better than others in these plain and palpable matters, of which every man can be a judge. Our proposed reformation will be no better than other abortive attempts, unless the precepts of Christ are regarded with all reverence, and obeyed with all precision; unless the disciples daily and hourly and habitually, carry into practice all the lessons of the Just One.

It is a common saying, that *justice* is a cardinal virtue: and it is in fact, the basis of all other virtues. There can be neither mercy nor generosity in the absence of justice. No man has the power of being generous, who is unjust. If he even bestow a favor upon an object of distress, he is robbing or depriving a fellow citizen of his just rights. He gives the property of another, without his consent.

An agent for a benevolent institution called upon 'Squire C—— for a donation. He gave him ten dollars. He next waited upon a very just and generous citizen, in the expectation of receiving from him a similar offering, but was informed he could not give him any thing. The agent, quite disappointed, said, 'Why, Mr. H, your neighbor, 'Squire C—— gave me ten dollars.' 'Indeed!' said Mr. H. with surprise, 'that is just the reason why I can give you nothing. That gentlemen has unjustly detained in his hands five hundred dollars belonging to me, which has made it almost impossible for me to meet my present engagements. If he had paid me honestly, I could have given you, and I might say, I would have given you, twenty dollars.' EDITOR.

Church Record.

IN reply to various questions, all embraced in the following;—"*Ought a Christian congregation to keep any record or history of its proceedings?*" the following remarks are respectfully offered.

Suppose for a moment, that all congregations of Christians had in all past times omitted to keep any record of their origin, progress, and proceedings; from what source could the history of the church, so necessary to the edification of christians, to the understanding of the times and seasons relative to prophecy, be acquired? A correspondent replies, 'From oral tradition.' Then *oral* is more certain

than written tradition. Then the invention of books and written records are not to be used by christians. For what reason? because memory is more stable than writing: because it is a sin for a church to use pen, ink, and paper!

'No,' replies another, 'because written records may be abused.' And may not speech be abused?—Why not then become Quakers in our meetings? 'But,' says a third, 'are we commanded to keep such records?' No; neither are we commanded to translate or print the Word of God. But why ask for a command to keep a record of the families of God, when we have all the records of Jews and Christians found in both Testaments, as an example or precedent before us; the benefits of which we are every day enjoying. What are the principal contents of the first *eighteen* books of the Jewish scriptures, but the authentic record or history of the ancient family of God!—Eighteen of the books of the Old Testament are family and church records; and these were collected from various private records, and by Divine authority, presented to be read by all the people of God in all the ages of the world.

All societies that have letters and know the use of writing, keep records. This is a usage as ancient as the invention of writing. The Bible is all the proof we need. Reference is frequently had to other church and family records, still more ancient than some of the Jewish records, such as those of Iddo and Jasher. These public documents were authentic, and used by the inspired writers,—appealed to as corroboratory of those records given by themselves.

The New Testament, also, is one half history. The book of the Acts gives us a general and summary record of the origin, progress, and proceedings of the whole church, down to the close of the apostolic age. Now, with all these documents before us, will any man of sense question the utility and necessity of such records, or ask for a warrant for every individual congregation keeping a regular history of its origin, progress and proceedings!—I was going to say, it is indispensable to the good order, and decent respect for mankind, in which the Apostle commands all things to be done.

Indeed, such is the imperfection of the memory of saints as well as that of sinners, that the discipline of the church must fail without such documents. A. B. left the church in Batavia, for example, on some day in 1829, (no member can tell the day nor the month) and went to the city of Athens, and was received a member there. He is accused of a gross misdemeanor—(a proper subject of discipline) which is said to have occurred about the time of his removal from Batavia. He denies the charge, and affirms that he was not in Batavia at that time. The church in Athens has no record of the time of his reception there, and are obliged to send a messenger to Batavia for information. But the church in Batavia were just as careless about church records as the church at Athens; and no one can tell when A. B. migrated to Athens. Now it may happen, for it has often happened, that a failure to establish the date of this incident, precludes the possibility of the accused vindicating himself. Such

cases are not of unfrequent occurrence; and many similar to them may be easily conceived, in which the credit and character of a church, and an individual member, depend upon having an authentic record.

But it is objected, that these records may become church articles, and bonds of union; and thus we may degenerate into church covenants, creeds, and all other sectarianisms. I presume there is no hypothesis more unwarrantable from all historic record, and from our own experience. I have never read nor heard of any society, confounding its *own history* with its faith. It is not much more plausible than that a christian family should keep no record in the Family Bible, of its births, deaths, or marriages, lest posterity should think that such a record in the good book is a part of Divine Revelation!

I should not think that such a subject deserved a grave argument, were it not, that some christians within my knowledge, have been so alarmed on the subject of articles, and rules of faith and manners, as to think it unsafe to have pen, ink, and paper, within the walls of a meeting-house; or to have their names enrolled, lest, by some strange vicissitude, it might be converted into a creed for posterity. This is certainly to be scared past Jerusalem; and to act unworthy of ourselves as men of understanding.

If we are to be governed by either Old Testament or New, in forming a correct judgment of what is useful and profitable to ourselves and others, we will certainly follow the example of the people of God in all ages, who kept true and faithful records of all God's dealings with them, and of all the principal incidents in their history. How often have we transcripts of the rolls of names, both in the Christian and Jewish history? How often have we not only the lists of names, but of the number of the names associated in different communities? And such was the aggregate information of the ancient christians on the subject of their own statistics, that the Elders in Jerusalem accosting Paul, said to him, "You see, brother, how many myriads of the Jews there are, who believe," &c. In the details of the Jerusalem church, we read of 120, of 3000, and of 5000 disciples, at different periods of the progress of reform in Jerusalem.

Every church, then, for all these reasons, but especially for the purpose of its own discipline and oversight of its members, ought to have its "*recorder*" and its record; in which will be found the following items:—

1. The date, or time and place of its commencement.
2. The names of all its members, at the time of its commencement or organization.
3. The additions made to it, by baptism or letter.
4. The persons recommended from it.
5. The persons excluded, and the reasons for such exclusion.
6. The decease of such as have finished their earthly course, with a notice of any interesting incidents in their life or death, that might unfold christian character, or God's providence.
7. Statements of all the proceedings of the congregation, at every

meeting for their own concerns, or for the general interests of the Kingdom of our Lord.

I do not set down these things as so many distinct chapters to be opened in the chronicles of the congregation; but that the history of every congregation should afford information on all these items, when it may be necessary either for its own good order, or for the general interests of the kingdom, to have information upon any of them.

Our own experience has forced this matter upon our attention; and the precedents before us, both in the Bible and in ecclesiastical history, as well as the queries of correspondents, present it as a matter of much importance to the well being and prosperity of the congregations of Jesus Christ. Be it remembered, that as the seas and oceans are made up of drops of water,—so the history of the church and of mankind, is composed of the biography of individuals, and of the records of innumerable small communities, which in their aggregate, develope human nature, and unfold the providence of God to mankind. EDITOR.

Form of a Church Record.

QUERY. "If a church should have a written record or history of its proceedings, what ought to be the preamble to it, or the form in which it ought to be kept?"

Every thing that ought to be done, ought to be done in the best manner. A thing not done right, is not done at all. The history of a church, ought to be neither more nor less than its history. Consequently, the history must begin with the origin of the society, and give a fair and correct narrative of all the incidents that characterize its progress. As an outline of what we mean, we shall give an extract from the history of one of the oldest churches in the Reformation.

EXTRACT.

CHAP. I.

"The congregation of Jesus Christ at ———, was organized on the —— day of ———, 18—. It was composed of the following persons: ———, ———. Some of these persons had previously been members of other churches; who, with testimonials of good moral and christian character, had withdrawn from their respective churches, because of a reluctance in those societies, to relinquish human creeds as a bond of union, and a refusal to follow the example of the first churches, in keeping all the ordinances delivered by the apostles. In coming together as a congregation, having already been immersed upon a confession of their faith in the Messiah, as the only begotten Son of God: they declared it to be their full purpose and determination to acknowledge no leader but Christ; no infallible teachers but the apostles and prophets; and no articles of be-

lief but the Old and New Testaments: and the latter, as containing their faith, and the rules of their behaviour as Christians.

Regarding all Protestant sects as building upon human opinions, equally with the Apostle's testimony, and in many instances, making void the word of God by their traditions,—and being resolved to stand perfect in the knowledge and practice of the revealed will of God: also, regarding the church as built only on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets—Jesus Christ himself, being the Chief Corner Stone; and it being the duty, honor, and happiness of the church, to preserve the unity of the Spirit, by the bond of peace,—there being "but one body and one spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all";—they have declared before God and to each other, that they are determined to do the whole will of God as far as they can understand it—to bear with one another, when they may differ in matters of opinion—to contend only and earnestly for the faith, formerly delivered to the saints—to be ever valiant for the truth—and to walk in obedience to the Lord alone, as their Prophet, Priest, and King. Thus giving themselves to the Lord and to one another, according to the will of God; they have agreed to walk together, as members of the Family of God, under the government of the Prince of Peace,—to whom be honor everlasting. Amen!"

[Here follow a list of the names, according to seniority in the kingdom of Jesus Christ, written by the brethren themselves.]

CHAP. II.

"November 20th, 18—. This day the following persons, who were immersed into the death of Christ, and put him on on the 15th inst.; were, by the unanimous consent of all the brethren, received into the church."

[Here follow the names of five persons, written by themselves.]

"At a special meeting of the church, December 23d, W. W. was unanimously chosen recorder of the congregation; and the records of the congregation were put into his hands for safe keeping.

J. T., and W. R., were appointed to preside in all the meetings of the congregation, pro tempore.

A query made by Brother G. H., viz: "Should any question arise amongst us on any point of expediency, connected with our proceedings; must we all be unanimous, before we act upon it?" was referred to a special meeting. Jan. 4, 18—.

W. P. was cordially recommended to the church in P———, being about to reside there for some time. And the recorder gave him a letter.

Met on Jan. 4, 18—. Present, all the congregation. After a little discussion, in which several brethren took part, it was agreed, that as there is but one faith, christians should be always unanimous in faith. But as there are some things not of faith, nor of precept, nor written law, but of opinion and of expediency; in all such things, it is unreasonable to expect unity of opinion; for the Apostles

themselves, differed in opinion upon a question of expediency, as Luke informs us, Acts xv. 36—41. And as it would be impossible in all cases of this sort to act at all, if we must wait till all are of one opinion—therefore it is agreed, that in such cases, the minority shall yield to the majority of the whole church, for it appears to us as at present advised, that it is more comely that the minority should yield to the majority, than that the majority should yield to the minority. The church now agreeing in this course, will be always agreed to every decision on such questions, and by each thinking of himself not more highly than he ought to think, we expect thus in all brotherly kindness and love, to be as kindly disposed to one another when in opinion we differ, as when we agree.

On Lord's day, Jan. 5th, the following persons were immersed, and added to the congregation: ———, ———. Whole number at this time—73.

Our beloved sister, J. L., fell asleep in Jesus, on the 13th ult. aged 39. She was an honorable citizen of the kingdom of Heaven. She confessed Jesus when she was eighteen years of age, and according to her knowledge, walked in him. She was the first person who requested to have a letter of recommendation from the church of H- - , after the church refused to commemmorate the Saviour's death every Lord's day."

Thus readeth the first two chapters.

I am not sensible of any reasonable objection which could be made against this mode of proceedure. Should there however, appear to any of our readers any objection to this form, or occur to him that there is a better one, we shall thankfully receive and consider it.

EDITOR.

Gift of the Holy Spirit---No. 6.

THE following scriptural phrases are worthy of special consideration, in attempting to understand what the Scriptures teach of the influence of the Holy Spirit, in the hearts of believers:—

"The Spirit bears witness with our spirit."—"Grieve not the Spirit."—"Quench not the Spirit."—"Led by the Spirit."—"Walk in the Spirit."—"Live after the Spirit."—"Strengthened with might by the Spirit in the inward man."—"Sanctification of the Spirit."—"Immersing into the name of the Holy Spirit."—"Communion of the Holy Spirit."

That the Spirit of God does influence believers, or work in their hearts, to think, will, and do, according to the good pleasure of God, is a proposition that no person, who has paid an ordinary attention to the writings of the Apostles and Prophets, can reasonably deny.

But concerning the nature, manner, and extent of this influence or operation, real christians have differed and may differ again, in their apprehensions and communications. Our province is to understand and teach the meaning of the words and sentences, which the

inspired writers have used on this subject, judging that when these are fairly and fully, that is, gramatically and logically understood, we are in possession of the ideas which God designed to communicate to us.

We have clearly seen in the examinations already completed, that the Spirit of God was the author of all the supernatural intelligence, wisdom, and power, which appear in the writings and doings of all God's messengers to men:—and that he is the author of all genuine *goodness* in the human heart, is quite apparent. We have also discerned, that all the *converting power*—or saving power, which the Spirit of God exerts on the human mind, is now in and by the word written, read or heard; for that where this word has never been heard or known, not one supernatural idea exists;—not one ray of spiritual or celestial light has shone.

> "'Tis midnight with the soul, till he,
> Bright Morning Star, bid darkness flee."

But whether this influence is direct or indirect; in the word only, or without the word; abstract and naked, or clothed with light and motive; have been, and still are, questions undecided by many. To assist such persons, is our supreme object in instituting the present investigation of words and phrases; and as we have already affirmed, we are now only concerned to know and communicate the true intent and meaning of the scripture style, as though we were examining a matter, on which we had formed no opinion ourselves.

Before we resume our philological labors on the phrases now before us for examination, it may be expedient to remark, with a special reference to the difficulties of some of the more thoughtful on this subject, that,—*the whole work of the Holy Spirit in the Apostles' time, was not to originate new ideas, nor to clothe men with supernatural and extraordinary powers;—such as speaking foreign languages, and tongues unknown before, and in controlling or suspending the laws of physical nature; but in strengthening the mind and memory, and in reviving the recollections of things said and done, in time long past,—and in reproducing the exact images of things which had vanished from the mind.* This is now simply premised, in reference to some phrases shortly to be examined; and to furnish to the curious speculators on this subject, some data, which at least are entitled to their consideration.

But we proceed to the phrase—"The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." Rom. viii. 16.—Com. ver. "Also the Spirit itself beareth witness together with our spirit, that we are the children of God."—Macknight. "Also this Spirit bears witness together with our spirit, that we are children of God."—New version, 4th edition.

The preceding verse which reads—"You have received the Spirit of adoption, by which we cry, Abba Father;" seems to present the argument thus: 'But this Spirit of adoption is not the only proof that the believing Gentiles are the adopted sons of God: for in ad-

dition to this, the spirit which has thus breathed into our hearts the Spirit of adoption, has *also* borne, and still bears witness to our sonship, by the spiritual gifts bestowed on the believing Gentiles.

Two witnesses are adduced by the Apostle, concurring in the establishment of the fact, that believing Gentiles are divinely constituted Sons of God. The first is the Spirit of adoption, which they had individually received; infusing into their hearts the cry, "Abba, Father:" the other, the extraordinary gifts, or the manifestations of the Spirit, bestowed equally upon the Gentiles, at, and after, their first calling into the kingdom of Jesus.

As Dr. McNight well observes—"God is said to have *sealed* the believing Gentiles as his sons, by giving them the Spirit." 2 Cor. i. 22; v. 5. Eph. i. 13. 14. "By the Spirit's witness, we are to understand a particular revelation to individuals;" the same translator distinctly affirms.

I have learned from Prof. Stuart's version of the epistle to the Romans, and his notes on this passage which appeared since my dissertation in 1830, on the 26th and 27th verses of this chapter, that I was not alone as I then apprehended, in supposing the Spirit of adoption to be "the Spirit that intercedes for us, in sighs which cannot be uttered;" for he testifies, page 324, that those who regard the Spirit of adoption spoken of in the 15th verse, to be the same with the spirit spoken of in the 16th verse, "compare this with verses 26 and 27, which they construe in the same way."

"For a long time," says the Professor, "I preferred this interpretation;" that is, making the Spirit of God, verse 16, the same as the Spirit of adoption, verse 15. "But," he adds, "repeated and attentive study of the whole passage in the connexion, has of late brought me to a pretty full persuasion, that *auto to pneuma*, verse 16, is the same as *pneuma theou*, verse 14;" or that *the Spirit of God*, rather than *the Spirit of adoption* is intended, in verse 16. I may add, that Professor Stuart in his version, renders the verse in examination, thus—"The same Spirit beareth witness to our spirit, that we are children of God." This may be sustained by Rom. ii. 15, ix. 1; but is not in so full accord with the word *summarturei*, according to the grammatical construction of the Greek language, as is the new version. The Professor's version would, however, better express my views of the passage than the new version, if it could be as well sustained. For it is *to* our spirit the witness is offered at last, read it as we may. I would paraphrase the passage thus. *"The Spirit of God* by his demonstrations or seal vouchsafed to the believing Gentiles, as well as to believing Jews, *bears witness to our understanding in conjunction* with the *Spirit of adoption*, which we have individually received, *that we are children of God.*

When we speak of testimony or witness, there are two things always to be taken into consideration;—the fact or proposition in support of which the testimony is presented,—and the person or persons to whom the testimony is offered. There is something to be proved; and some person to whom or for whom it is to be proved. Now, a

person cannot be both the subject and the object of the same testimony himself. For example. Let the question be, '*Am I a child of God?*' This is to be ascertained for my own satisfaction. *I* am the person *to whom* it is to be proved. There is something represented by the pronoun *I*, which is constituted judge in this case. This then cannot be both witness and judge. A witness *in me* must be something distinct *from me*. Well: what is the witness in me distinct from myself, unless it be the Spirit of adoption breathing in me all filial dispositions? Now if Paul and his companions rejoiced in the testimony of their own conscience, why may I not rejoice in the testimony of this witness? But as this is but one witness, and as every thing of importance requires two witnesses; and especially as this witness may be suspected of being under the influence of near relation and not easily cross examined, it requires a concurrent testimony. Now this is that which the Spirit of God has presented in the written word,—sealed by its own demonstrations. An exact correspondence between these two witnesses begets full confidence, or satisfactorily answers the question—'*Am I a child of God?*'

But it must be observed, that the testimony of God in the authenticated word, and the testimony within, are both necessary to the full assurance of our sonship. Hence, John says—"If our heart condemn us not, then we have confidence." By loving "not in word only, but in deed and in truth," says the divine Apostle, "we know that we are of the truth, and shall assure our hearts before him." Happy frames and good feelings are no evidence of our sonship, unless sustained by the testimony in the Holy Scriptures. And this calls for unreserved obedience to all the commandments of Jesus.

But while this and much more may be necessary to illustrate the testimony borne to our spirits by the Spirit of God; the fact that such a witness exists, and the bare meaning of the phrase, are all that fairly lie within our present object. The Apostle's design in the connexion in which the phrase occurs, clearly ascertains its import. His proposition is; "As many as are led by the Spirit, these are *the sons* of God." "*To be led by the Spirit*," or to be led by any person, is simply to be guided by what they say. Those thus led, are children of God. That they are the children of God, is proved to themselves by two witnesses;—what the Spirit has testified in the written word, and sustained by miracles,—and by the filial dispositions, called the Spirit of adoption, which it has inspired into the hearts of all the believers, whether Jews or Gentiles. EDITOR.

"Christian Theology in the East."

NOTTINGHAM, HARRISON Co., O., *Sept. 10th*, 1834.

Dear Brother Campbell.

IN the "*Christian Palladium*," printed at Union Mills, Montgomery county, New York, Joseph Badger, Editor; Dr. Jones, (one

of their ministers) has commenced giving an account of the "rise and progress of the Christian sect." His sketches, (of which the one before me is the third number,) are written in a very *charitable* style—embracing the various surrounding sects, in the "arms of fellowship." Hear him. "As a test of church membership, we have two things to ascertain; and first, to gain the evidence that they are born of the Spirit." How gain the evidence? From the subjects of such a birth, I presume: surely not from the "record;"—*there* it reads—"water and Spirit." "Secondly; that they walk in newness of life. With these *two* evidences, we are perfectly satisfied."!—"He may be a Calvinist, or an Arminian; he may be a Trinitarian, or a Unitarian—if he walk as the humble pious Christian." Again—"We uniformly hold to believer's baptism, and that by immersion; yet we make not this a test of membership: for we understand, [where?] that whosoever is born of God, is born into the church of the First Born, whose names are written in heaven; and so we rejoice to have their names written in our church books."

How dull and insipid all this! My health will not permit me at this time, to make any remarks on the above. I hope you will pay it a passing notice. I must treat you, however, to another extract from said "*Christian* Palladium." In the same number from which I have made the above quotation, there is a long article, headed—"*Four Cardinal Points*," viz: One God—The Holy Bible—Water Baptism—and Christian Fellowship. What precision! I shall now transcribe the third *Cardinal* point.

"Water Baptism, by immersion, is an institution *in* the church of God: is a duty enjoined on all such, as "*believe* with all the heart:" are made glad by the word: have brought forth fruits requisite for repentance: and have their hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience. No others can perform this holy duty understandingly. The candidate must have light in the understanding, rectitude in the conscience, zeal in the heart, and purity in the life. This institution is not to be altered and changed by fallible man, to suit the fancy and vain imagination of the world: it is not to be carried *out* of the church, to be administered to those who are without hope, faith, and love; it never being designed for unbelievers. Nor is it to be made a door into the church; for Christ is the door, the *way*, the *truth*, and the *life*. But it is a testimony to be borne by all the family of God on earth."

The above may very justly be styled—"A specimen of '*Christian* Theology' in the East." Now, sir, if you feel disposed to *un*twist the above "*twistifications*," I should be highly gratified. To some, the above extracts would seem perfectly trifling—not worth minding. But remember, they claim to be "Liberal Christians"—"Pinks of Piety:" and the above, taken from their writings, is a part of their system, entitled, "Liberal Christianity."

Yours, to serve in the Truth,
ROBERT COOK.

Sectarian Inconsistencies Exposed.

HILLSBOROUGH, *Ky.* September 28, 1834.

Brother Campbell,

THE inconsistencies of Arminians, their infatuated tenacity to defend them, and their continued blindness respecting the incompatibility of their unsystematic systems, are, to me, truly astonishing. For, if the position be proven that men are saved by sovereign grace *alone*, in the popular sense, then Calvinism or Universalism is true; and of both of these I must, as yet, remain incredulous. I have been, myself, a teacher in the sectarian fraternity for seven years, and about four years a proclaimer of the gospel of Jesus Christ, during which time (eleven years) my mind has been employed on many topics; and, among the rest of my thoughts, I have been impressed with the idea that the greater proportion of the religious disputation, now in the ranks of sectarians, is concerning things not written in the Book; such as sprinkling for baptism; eternal and unconditional election, trinity, &c. &c. Yes, and their sectarian establishments, such as the Baptist Church, the Methodist Church, the Presbyterian Church, and a number of others, are alike antiscriptural.

Fatality is an idea that is quite repulsive to the feelings of many persons; and yet those persons tenaciously contend for that which is the same thing in substance. For, when Calvinism or Arminianism is carried out, it runs into fatalism. The Calvinist says, 'Christ died for the elect, and those for whom Christ died will be unconditionally saved.' So, then, if Calvinism be true, and Christ has died for me, I shall be saved most assuredly; but if not, then damnation is my unavoidable and dismal fate. The Arminian, of more pretended liberality, says, 'Christ died to make salvation possible to all men, but none can obtain this provided salvation unless the Holy Spirit operates physically and irresistibly upon the heart.' So, then, the difference in Calvinism and Arminianism is this: One says Christ died for a part, and that part was eternally elected to life through him; the other says he died for every body, and will save to the uttermost all that come to God by him; but, how are we to come, for both agree in saying that none can act unless the Spirit operates, and the Spirit will operate only when and where it pleases; and when it operates none can resist its influence. The fatality of man, then, is this: If Christ has died for him, and the Spirit of God operates upon his heart, and brings him to evangelical repentance, he will be saved; otherwise, awful and irremediable desperation is the destiny of the poor unfortunate creature.

This shocking and God-dishonoring doctrine does not seem to comport with Paul's view of this matter; for he says (2 Cor. v. 10.) we are to be rewarded according to the deeds done in our bodies, whether good or bad. Christ speaks of the good man, (Matth. xii. 35.) Christ says in other places, "*Blessed* is he that *does* the commandments," &c. "He that hears these sayings of mine, and *does* them, is like a *wise* man." Now, if the foregoing doctrines of the sects be true, then

there can be no wisdom in doing or working at all; for there is more wisdom in doing nothing than in doing things that are useless.

The Apostle says, "Without faith we cannot please God." And the orthodox say, 'Faith is the gift of God.' Then nothing can be done till God gives faith; so the creature may remain at ease until God pleases to act upon him in this way. But the Arminian and some inconsistent Calvinists will say, "Pray for faith." But how can I pray acceptably without faith, and how can I have faith until God pleases to give it, if faith be the gift of God, as they say? This is what *they* say. Now let us hear what *Paul* says; and there we learn that faith is the substance of things hoped,—the conviction of things not seen, and *comes* by *hearing*, and hearing by the word of God. The Presbyterian Confession of Faith says (60th Ques. Larger Catechism) that those who have never heard the gospel cannot be saved. Then are we not left to bemoan the awful fate of infants, idiots, heathens, &c.? They have no chance for salvation if this position be true, as we find in this 60th question.

The Methodist Discipline says that Christ died to reconcile his Father to us; but Paul says he died to reconcile the world to God. "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." (2 Cor. v. 19.) James says in another place that in God is "no variableness nor shadow of turning." (ch. i. ver. 17.) If God was reconciled to the world, (with which he was previously irreconciled,) I know not how to avoid the conclusion that a change was wrought in God by Christ's death, or at least the *shadow* of a change.

A certain Mr. Corwine, at the Poplar Plains, not long since, in a little controversy with Mr. Kidwell, on finding himself in a difficulty, said, that God had varied from, or was frustrated in, his design; and, as an instance, named the case of Nineveh. Now it seems to me that God, in this case, acted as he has invariably acted; that is, forgave them their sins when they reformed their lives. I mean no invidiousness in mentioning the name of Mr. Corwine. He is a gentleman whom I respect. What I have said concerning this controversy is from information. I was not present.

Mr. Kidwell contended with me that *aionon*, translated eternal, means indefinite duration. I asked him, If it means indefinite time when followed by *punishment*, &c. why not when followed by *life?* If he is right, then we have no evidence of an eternity at all—we die like brutes, to live no more. If I am in the dark here, you will confer a favor to give me a little light. Mr. Kidwell gave me no satisfaction on this subject.

The orthodox say that sinners are converted to God by the operations of his Spirit: but I would delight in knowing where Jesus or any of his Apostles ever ascribed a single conversion to the operation of the Spirit. I have, both publicly and privately, challenged the whole orthodox fraternity to show one instance. They have not done it—they cannot do it. For, in the New Testament, conversions are invariably ascribed to the *word of God*. "Born again, not of corruptible, but incorruptible seed, by the *word* of God," &c. "And this

is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." (1 Peter i. 23 & 25.) Again—I have begotten you through the gospel. (1 Cor. iv. 15.) Begotten us by the word of truth. (James i. 18.) Paul says (Rom. i. 16.) the gospel is *the* power of God to salvation to those who believe. But in order to bring Paul's words to suit their theory, they adroitly slip in the adjunct, "when attended by the Spirit." Then the text would read thus: 'I am not ashamed of the gospel, for it is the power of God, when attended by the Spirit, unto salvation to them who believe.' Such a thing as the word being attended, or made powerful by the Spirit, is not to be found in the good Book. "The word of God is living and powerful." James says the word of God is capable of saving our souls. Christ prayed to his Father to save the Apostles by the truth. "Thy word is truth." (17th chap. John's testimony.)

If one of our professed ambassadors or plenipotentiaries was asked by a penitent sinner, as thousands asked Peter on Pentecost, I presume his answer would be quite different from Peter's. Peter told them to "reform and be immersed for the remission of sins," &c.; but the popular plan now-a-days, is, 'Come to the mourning bench, or anxious seat, and pray for faith, remission, &c. and the circuit rider will help them pray. But the Apostles had no circuit riders—no anxious seat—no mourning bench—no class-meeting. Sinners, by them, were never directed to pray, nor promised any thing for praying. If any say I am wrong, let him show to the contrary. I am astonished to see how blind the popular teachers are, to their inconsistencies, and the mischief they are doing. Some, by them, are led to universalism—some to deism—some to scepticism. Others believe the word, but are waiting for the operation of God's Spirit to lead them to reformation toward God and faith in Jesus Christ. But it will be said that these do not believe. Let us see: Suppose I ask him if he believes in Christ? To suit the popular dogmas he answers, 'I do not know, but I would give a thousand worlds to believe.' Then I will ask, Do you believe in Mahomet? 'No,' says he. Why? 'Because I cannot believe he is the character that I need to save me from my sins.' Why give so much, then, to believe in Christ? 'Because I *believe* he is the Son of God, the Saviour of the world, and calculated to save me from my sins.' Then you would give a thousand worlds to believe what you already do believe!——Strange infatuation!! Miserable inconsistency!!!——O! when will the scales of delusion fall from the eyes of mankind.

Respectfully yours, in the hope of immortal bliss and glory,

S. K. MILTON.

Modern Order of Things.

FRIEND Brainerd, from whose paper the following article is taken, having several times noticed the Millennial Harbinger and its Editor, having spoken in very high terms of Dr. Cleland's late publication, and admitted into his columns two or three most scur-

ilous commendatory pieces on that delectable work;—it is no more than fair, we think, that Brother Campbell should reciprocate the favor—at least in so far, as to give an extract containing a specimen of the spirit and order of things, for which that branch of the Presbyterian Church contends—to which friend Brainerd belongs, and of which he is the humble advocate. For this purpose, we have cut out, "*She'll make a Manager!!*"

ADELPHOS.

From the Cincinnati Journal.

SHE'LL MAKE A MANAGER!!

FURNISHED BY A LADY.

"Have you asked Miss L——e to become a member of our society?" said the President of an "Education and Missionary Society" to one of the committee, appointed to obtain subscribers.

"No," replied Miss S——k, "I did not think it worth while to ask Clara, for she does not cordially approve of such things."

"O," returned the President, "just put her name down for a *manager*, and I dare say she will join. Miss Clara is one of these—you know there are some that will be brought in this way—she is a little strange, you know; i. e. she is a little *particular*."

Particular! said I to myself, what can that mean? I knew she was formal and precise in her manner and appearance, but she is amiable, and sensible, and what has her *particularities* to do with a missionary society? what is she more than any other, that she must be made a *manager*, to induce her to become a *member*? The speakers were my superiors in age, wisdom and experience; but I could not avoid revolving the question in my mind, Is it quite judicious to make a person a *manager* of a society in which she is not *sufficiently interested* to be a *private* member? However her name was put down; she was formally notified, and accepted the appointment.

I was a mere child then: but as years have rolled over my head, I have had occasion to observe many, very many, that would engage in a good cause, if they could only be *managers*. Is it because their benevolence is so great, they wish to bear the burden? or is their selfishness so great, they desire the *honor?*

Some again, would like to engage in benevolent operations; but they cannot bear to fall in with plans that have originated independent of them.

Others again, long to do good, if they only knew how—they wish some field of usefulness was opened for *them*, they wish they could exert the benevolent feelings of their hearts, i. e. they wish to be *managers* of something, whereby they may be distinguished; they will enter the field if there is some *royal* road to it—but they think nothing of being useful to those around them; in the humble walks of private life, they are not careful to exert a happy influence by a holy or consistent walk and conversation; they overlook an opportunity to give the youthful mind a proper bias—they care not to visit

the widow, and the fatherless in their obscurity—they care not to minister to the needy and afflicted, whom the world rejects—they regard not the beggar that is laid at their gate—yet these would all be managers of some *great thing* or even some *small thing*, provided they could be the centre of attraction. They would delight to raise contributions to carpet the pulpit stairs, or to present their minister a handsome cloak; for this would be *talked* of in the town they lived—they would even make a box of garments, to send to the Greeks, if it would be published in all the newspapers and journals of the day; but they belong not to that class, who let not their right hand know what their left hand doeth. When I hear persons ostentatiously telling of their good deeds, and enumerating the different societies to which they belong, relating the private arrangements of the societies, &c., I say to myself, these are *managers*, perhaps—and they manage to make a considerable display of vanity among all their works.

Some managers make so much bustle and put on such an air of consequence, such a look of concern, abstraction, &c., that it is impossible not to know they have an *office*.

Some of the great talkers, that overwhelm you with their volubility about their charities, &c., are like a great torrent, that expends itself with its own force; and when we look for verdure, we find nothing but barrenness, instead of that fertility, that a peaceful, *steady*, unobtrusive stream, would have produced.

Are there any among us that would be members *merely* for the honor of being *managers?* M.

For the Millennial Harbinger.

ESSEX COUNTY, VA., *Sept. 4th*, 1834.

Brother Campbell.

DEAR SIR:—You, no doubt, would like to hear how the state of things is around us. I therefore, will endeavor to give you a short history of the proceedings of the Sects, and the progress of the Disciples. Early in the summer, the Baptists and Methodists were very much united against the disciples of Jesus Christ. The Methodists first began with their recruiting machinery. They held their three or four day's meetings, in the neigborhoods around us. Their *altars* and *mourning benches* were erected, and sinners were invited to come to them, that *they* might act as intercessors between God and sinners, by their prayers for them—thus setting aside Jesus Christ, as the only intercessor between God and man. The timid, ignorant, and nervous, had the horrors of hell, and blackness of darkness, presented before them: their passions were aroused almost to insanity. The Baptists, finding they were likely to be outstripped by the Methodists, followed in their train, only exceeding them in their fanaticism. The Baptists had their six day's meeting. The Methodists followed with their camp meetings. They labored day and night to *increase their numbers*. They boasted of making one hundred and twenty converts at one of their meetings, but only ten would join them at that time. One of their preachers was asked, what became of the one hundred and ten, if they did not join them? He said they were still in their sins. Challenges were given by the Methodists, to their beloved brethren the Baptists, to discuss publicly, the subject of baptism. This

they declined to do. Camp meetings were then published, near the ground the Methodists had occupied. The Methodists, it is said, challenged our quondam hero—Broaddus, upon the unchristian conduct of the Baptists in taking away their disciples. The Methodists said, they *mulled the rails*, and the Baptists *put them into their fences*. Others of their preachers said, they shook down the persimons, and the Baptists like dogs, gathered them. Thus the unholy alliance is broken up. Our friend Broaddus, rumor says, has lately got converted to the fanaticism of the Methodists; and in his zeal, has outstripped them. His anxious seats and mourning benches, can do more towards the conversion of sinners, than the teaching of Peter or Paul, or even Jesus Christ. The *passions* of the people have been so worked upon, that nothing is considered by many as christianity, that does not go to the *mourning benches and anxious seats,—there to let the priests act the part of intercessors between them and God!* This surpasses the Roman hierarchy. They always had some Saint supposed to be in heaven, to intercede between them and the Saviour. But our modern priests have transcended the anti-christian Babylon; they make up peace between God and the afflicted people! Is not this the very essence of priest-craft? These men still tell the people, "they take the Bible as their guide and directory." What hypocrisy! Surely the signs of the times indicate the approach of the downfall of Babylon. The people are built upon vain deceit, after the traditions of the elders. Such screaming and hollowing at all hours of the night, never was heard among the Baptists, until the inspiring Spirit of *this generation*, was poured upon them. The Baptists have evidently apostatized from their original platform—Calvinism.

The Disciples are progressing on, in the even tenor of their way. We have occasionally additions by immersion. We want Evangelists; men that can spend the whole of their time in the field; whose talents and piety will commend them to the attention of the people. My infirmities with my age, have almost laid me aside this summer. I have lived to enjoy health, longer than my ancestors or brothers. Our much beloved brother Thomas, is active in proclaiming the ancient gospel. I trust he will prove an Apollos with the disciples. His Advocate appears undaunted.

I am more and more pleased with the ancient gospel and order of things. In the two churches I occasionally visit, containing between thirty and fifty members each; though standing between three and four years, not a solitary case of discipline has occurred among us. I was with the Baptists eighteen years; and seldom attended a *monthly meeting*, without having to deal with disorderly persons. I immersed last Lord's day, an amiable, intelligent disciple; the wife of the Clerk of the Superior Court of Caroline county. A more affecting scene between man and wife, I have never witnessed on such an occasion. On her rising from the grave of water, he ran into the water and embraced her; and seemed almost overcome with the solemnity of the occasion. I trust his mind will be more engaged upon the one thing needful in time to come. He is represented as an amiable character: such we want among us. Yours, in the hope of a joyful resurrection,

THOMAS M. HENLEY.

Progress of Reform.

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

Tennessee, Maury Co. July 8th, 1834.

THE church at Cathey's creek has lately had some addition to its number; ten, I believe, in the course of last month. Our congregations increase in number: unity and peace prevail. Opinions are discarded as rules of government. The brethren and sisters rapidly increase in the intelligence of the sa-

cred volume. Several baptisms have taken place in Columbia, within a few weeks past. The great probability is, that a respectable body of disciples will, in a short time, be formed in that place. A church has lately been formed in another section of Maury: respectable additions have been lately made to it. On the whole, the reformation is prospering beyond our anticipations.

JAMES. N. BROWN.

Owen Co., Ind., July 25th, 1834.

THE good news which the Harbinger brings monthly, of the success of the old gospel over sectarianism, is matter of rejoicing to the humble followers of Jesus, in this section of country. It is with pleasure, I read those extracts of letters published in the Harbinger, from the brethren in different parts of the United States; and believing that you and your readers would be delighted to hear good news from Indiana, I will state the following particulars, viz: on the fourth Lord's day in March, was a meeting near Crawfordsville, of the brethren, from the different congregations north of the west fork of White river. The design of the meeting was to ascertain, who would agree to act as Evangelists, in this northern district of Indiana. Teaching brethren from several counties in the district of country north of the west fork of White river, were present; but "they were of one heart, and of one soul." During the meeting, five made the good confession, and were forthwith buried with our Lord by immersion. Brethren Michael Comly and Jas. R. Ross, were appointed to travel this season. Also, Brethren Andrew Prather and Job Comly, expect to travel considerably. These brethren, with many others who do not travel much, are proclaiming the old gospel with success, in the country near Crawfordsville, Montgomery county: truth is victorious. I lately understood, that a considerable number of the Methodist friends near Crawfordsville, have been planted together in the likeness of the death of Jesus. The exact number we do not know, but I think about twenty-five. Also, near LaFayetteville, there is a good work. In short, I would say; victory is on the side of truth: yes, powerful is the truth, and will prevail. Thank God, I do believe that the gospel preached eighteen hundred years ago by the fishermen, will yet take the world—unpopular as it now is. I believe that the kingdom of this world, will yet become the kingdom of the Babe of Bethlehem, who is now exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour; but has promised to pay our world another visit, at which time he will put down all human rule and authority.

J. M. MATHES.

Williamson, Lowndes Co. Ala., Aug. 14th, 1834.

IN this latitude, our old-side Baptist friends are making rapid strides, in the science of new inventions! But like Napoleon, they are not sufficiently discriminating, to *divine* the ultimatum of all their projects! Napoleon entered Moscow, which was the torch that lighted the fire of independence through subject Europe; but soon met a sad disappointment, by the conflagration of the city. With the breath of the last flickering hope, he cried out, "Where you cannot extinguish, plunder!" Horrors upon horrors now succeeded!!—The disappointed project of our friends here, (at a church denominated Shiloah, which place, you know was *renowned* in olden times,—there Samuel began to prophesy, 1 Sam. iv. 1; and there the prophet Ahijah dwelt, 1 Kings xiv. 2; Jeremiah also said something about it, Jer. vii. 13, 14, also xxvi. 6;) is this: having, as they are, become quite alarmed about the craft, they assembled the chief priests and scribes of the people together, to concert plans for the discomfiture of the "Ancient Gospel;" which seems destined, with the velocity of the playful lightnings, to ransack the whole earth. Their policy was to call in their neighbors of the paido-baptist kingdoms, and make a vigorous attack, being panoplied with the armory of Calvin, Wes-

ley, Gill, Fuller, &c.; and to extend their efforts through what is denominated here, a protracted campaign. But after the invitation had been extended for these new helps, it was recollected, that on the Lord's day of the proposed meeting, the "loaf" was to be broken, according to the unscriptural quarto-yearly arrangement. Some of the members, being more acute than others, "espied afar off," an insurmountable difficulty; which was, that those paide friends might work, but could not eat at their table, with unwashed hands. But they are now engulphed by the arrangement; and how to extricate *themselves*, is a question, which tortures much their brains. There is but one escape,—either to omit the breaking of the loaf, or hear the tale of inconsistency from morning till night. * * *

The loaf is passed by!—the meeting advances. The institution of heaven trampled under foot. The beauties of God's revelation despoiled: and the whole beatific glories of the *Bible, defaced!* And all for what? To perpetuate the present anti-christian, anti-scriptural, and anti-godly schemes of the day! But, thank heaven, into powder, all opposition to Christ's kingdom, is to be ground. The insoluble query with the people, concerning this affected friendship, is:—Why these pretended approaches to friendship, between whom, there has existed the most deadly hatred, and every evil passion; seeing that the same causes of difference yet exist? As well might the enquiry be made:—Why terms of amity between Herod and his foe, at that momentous crisis?

Another advance, upon the part of our old friends here. They have what they are pleased to call, an "Abstract of Faith;" (not the New Testament,) but eleven short articles, which have been considered the *sine qua non* of fellowship: and after using it as the infallible rule of "orthodoxy," and even by it, drawn a discrimination between themselves: and some who have had courage to oppose this humanizing, carnalizing, and secularizing instrument, (the creed) have at length discovered its impotency "to save or rule." And what course would you divine, that they have pursued? Assuredly you will respond, there is but one redeeming course; and that is, to abandon human rule for the Word of God—which is given for doctrine, reproof, correction, &c. No! they have referred that same God-dishonoring instrument, to seven men, for correction or amendment. And it is not certain, that either of them could recite, at memory, the books of the Old and New Testaments, in the order which they stand. It is rumored, that they would be glad to blot out the *ink*, that made the impression on their minutes: for the reason, that the same little document (the minutes,) contains an anathema against an individual, for his derelictions against its contents, and his predilections for the Bible entire. The censure of that individual for opposing the instrument, was quite premature, at least; for there is some probability, that the new Magna Charta, will breathe a more favorable breath to "reformation," than the *old* one!

J. A. BUTLER.

Rutland Vt., August 18th, 1834.

I HAVE been laboring in word and doctrine for some two or three years past, and I trust with some success. I have travelled in different parts of the State of Ohio, but till of late, have been confined to no particular district of this State. I saw with numbers more, that much was lost on the account of not preaching more regularly. Sometimes I with others, would visit places at a distance, preach the word in the hearing of the people, and would frequently immerse some, and leave them perhaps, to see them no more in this world:—sometimes hearing from some such places, those who had been immersed being left without further instruction, and among their enemies, had either fallen into sin, or joined themselves to some sec-

tarian body, &c. To remedy this, has been our great desire. Consequently there was a meeting appointed in May 1833, in Athens county, Ohio, for the purpose of setting things in order. Brethren attended from several congregations. After discussing the subject, it was proposed that choice should be made by the brethren of two or more Evangelists, to travel on a circuit; and those Evangelists should have so much per year. Accordingly Brother John Read and myself were chosen. We commenced. The first six months we immersed between eighty and ninety, within our bounds; and we endeavored to organize them in proper church order, with officers, as did the Apostles in ancient times. The brethren met again, May 1834, and were well pleased with the proceedings of the past year. They made choice of Brother Sanders and myself to travel this present year: Brother Read was so circumstanced, he could not travel for some time.

The first Saturday and Sunday in August of this year, we held a meeting in Knox county: five were immersed for remission. Among these was a doctor lately from Ireland: he is a man of intelligence, and I think perhaps, will engage in proclaiming the word of the Lord to the world. He has formerly been a licensed exhorter, &c. Tuesday following, we held meeting four miles distant from that place, when ten more made the good confession, and were immersed for remission;—blessed be the name of King Jesus. Every species of opposition is resorted to in order to prejudice the people against us as teachers. They (the sects) tell their adherents, we are deluded creatures, led away by A. Campbell; they say you have translated the Testament, just to suit your favorite views, and we are preaching accordingly; and I had like to have said a thousand other things of a like nature, to keep their hearers from hearing us;—but some of them will break over their bounds, and hear for themselves.

JOHN SARGENT.

Carlowsville, Ala., July 31st, 1834.

NOT many new moons since, a Baptist orator of Calvinistic memory, filed a bill of indictment, against what he was pleased to call, C—ism. The pathos of his soul, was fanned by this breeze, John iii. 5. After ordering his compass and needle, he set sail into the depths of metaphysical perplexity; and after passing many friths, and losing much of his tacklings, he disappeared!

This was the course of this strange mariner. "Except a man be born of *water* and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Nor for the "*divinity*" of it, or spirituality! "By water, is not meant material *water*, or baptismal water; for water baptism is never expressed by *water* only, without some additional word, which shows that the ordinance of water baptism is intended. Nor has baptism any regenerating influence in it. A person may be baptized, as Simon Magus was, and yet not be born again; and is so far from having any such virtue, that a person ought to be born again, before he is admitted to that ordinance." Again. "By *water*, is meant in a figurative or metaphorical sense, the grace of God, as it is elsewhere, Ezek. xxxvi. 25; John iv. 14; which is the moving cause of this new birth, and according to which, God begets men again to a lively hope: and not by the free will of the creature." If the "orator" was not misunderstood, he said, "That the reason why Christ used this figure to Nicodemus, was, because

that Nicodemus was an officer in the temple, that took care to provide water at the feasts." When the "orator" discussed "regeneration," it could be but regretted, that all who are called Reformers, were not present. And as they were not, I think it advisable to publish it, for their high benefit.

"Regeneration is sometimes ascribed to God the Father, as in 1 Peter i. 3, James i. 18; and sometimes to the Son, as 1 John ii. 29; and here to the Spirit, as in Titus iii. 5; who convinces of sin, sanctifies, renews, works faith, and every other grace; begins and carries on the work of grace to perfection; and unless a man has this work of his wrought on his soul, he'll never understand divine and spiritual things, or things appertaining to the kingdom of God: nor can he be thought to have passed from death to life, and to have entered into an open state of grace, and the kingdom of it;" &c.

Is it not enough, my dear brother, to make one weep tears of blood, to hear the Word of God so traduced? and by men too, who claim to be specially called to preach! And men who claim much originality! O, that God would call them again; and that the next call might be from such "Gillism," to the words of Jesus Christ and the Apostles.

J. A. Butler.

Ebensburg, Cambria Co., Pa., Sept. 4th, 1834.

BROTHER Tibbot and myself have requested Brother John Thomas of the Advocate, to come over and help us. I stated to him, that pamphlets or any written publications, were not sufficient to enlighten the people in general; (although some individuals can be benifited by them) without the co-operation of personal instruction to enforce the truth, and apply it touchingly to the people, to move them to action, and to set matters in order; to clear away the rubbish of old establishments, and to withstand the torrents of abuse heaped upon the scripture, and the judgments of men, who are led more by their feelings than their understandings. For when men read these publications, the orthodoxites bring forward multitudes of scriptures, to turn them away from these things, and create in them a suspicion and a fear to trust these things, and lull them to carelessness and slumber. Had you but heard the preaching which we heard last Lord's day, from one of the Independent preachers, your spirit would have been stirred up within you, and brought tears of feeling and pity, for preacher and people. I may give you some outlines of this sermon, at some future opportunity. He had a two-fold text, viz: 1 Tim. ii. 4, and Isaiah lxvi. 10. The Rev. Wm. Shadrach has asserted to Brother Davis, that John iii. 5, should read according to the Greek, as follows: "Except a man be born of water, *which is* the Spirit," &c. I request you to notice this, and inform us faithfully, whether there be in the original, any word corresponding to "*which is*," or not.

E. Davis.

Jamestown, O., Sept. 6th, 1834.

OUR church is growing some. Eight were added at a three day's meeting here in August; which was attended by Bro. Dulin, of Kentucky, as chief speaker. Your fellow servant,

M. Winans.

Carlowsville, Ala., Sept. 27th, 1834.

THE disciples here, break the loaf once a month—it being as often as I can attend with them, on Lord's days. We meet once a week, (on Wednesday) for the purpose of reading the Scriptures. We read to day the 19th chap. of Matthew's testimony. We have a brother (George Gabbert) of great promise. May God speed him on. Our brethren here, are pious and devout. I immersed, yesterday, an old veteran from the Methodist army, for the remission of his sins. Another from the *old* dominions, (a Baptist) came

over to the good and growing cause of reformation. Another is now under guard for faulting his old regimentals. Many others are speaking very favorably of the *new* tac-tics. There is great confusion in the camps. New alliances are forming between the sects. The former discordant notes are changing into sectarian paeans. How changed the aspect, for the better, during the last six months. The battle is God's.

J. A. BUTLER.

Pleasant Exchange, Henderson Co. Tenn., Sept. 1st, 1834.

THERE is a congregation of our brethren in the neighborhood (Roane creek,) composed of about forty brothers and sisters, living in great union and harmony; but they have not yet commenced meeting together, as did the first Christians, to keep the Lord's day, by fellowship, breaking of the loaf, and prayer. The more I see, and more experience I acquire, the more I am convinced, that all citizens of the kingdom should, as far as in their power, keep all the ordinances and laws of their King. While we live in wilful disobedience, we are not and cannot be, good and loyal subjects and citizens; and ought not to expect to inherit the everlasting kingdom, prepared from the foundation of the world. We preach up the necessity and obligation of observing *all* the commands of our King; and if we do not observe them, we preach what we do not practise. Our profession will appear to the world a hollow one: and others seeing our conduct, will not be induced to obey. There is also a congregation in the lower part of Carroll, (Crooked Creek) consisting of about the same number of disciples, as the above. I have not yet learned that they meet regularly to keep the ordinances. Wherever I go, I shall impress the importance of it upon all.

J. R. HOWARD.

New York, Sept. 11th, 1834.

I AM happy to inform you, that our congregation continues to enjoy the smiles of our heavenly Father. We feel grateful in reflecting on your valuable labors among us last year, and would be glad that you would repeat your visit this season. Our beloved Elder Barker, is assiduously and disinterestedly engaged, publicly and privately, in presenting the glad tidings of salvation, as most worthy of all acceptation. We meet three times regularly every Lord's day. The morning is employed in teaching the Chistian religion, and enforcing its holy precepts and examples, as demonstrated by our blessed Lord, and his Apostles. The afternoon is wholly devoted to the breaking of the loaf, fellowship, prayers, and praise; together with the exhortations of the brethren generally. We chose the afternoon for these precious exercises stated, only on account of its being the most convenient time for our brethren to attend. The evening is generally taken up in presenting the philanthropy of God, in the glad tidings of salvation, to a lost world, and urging obedience to our great King. The powerful word has in a good measure, a free course; and is glorified. Though we cannot boast of great and sudden accessions to our number, yet there are regular additions from time to time—intelligently believing and confessing the Lord Jesus, on the testimony of the Apostles and Prophets—obeying the laws of Christ our King—being introduced into his kingdom, by putting him on in immersion. We have had ten added to our number within the last two months: we now number above a hundred members. A number are now expected to come out fully, and appear on the Lord's side. Being thus unshackeled from the cunning devices, the commandments and doctrines of men, we feel and rejoice in the liberty, with which Christ has made us free. We take the book of God for our chart, for our only rule of faith and practice. Therefore, trusting in the Captain of our Salvation, we cherish the glorious hope, blooming with immortality. May God bless all the disciples.

DANIEL MONROE.

Throopsville, Cayaga Co. N. Y., Sept. 11th, 1834.

THERE is utterly a fault, which militates much against the progress of the Apostles' doctrine, and ought to be corrected: the fault is this. There are persons who are anti-proclaimers of the gospel, and are associated with the disciples. Some of these persons have long groaned under the intolerable burden, which the clergy have imposed upon them; but after they have discovered, by the labors of our brethren who write and proclaim, that we have no need of the labors of the popular clergy; they have run into an opposite extreme, and oppose the publishing of the gospel, to those who labor under the burthens which they formerly did. Now, this a fault; and there is one thing to be noted—that those who identify the proclaiming brethren with clergymen, and make efforts to put down all proclaiming, manifest, if possible, a mere tyrannical spirit, than even popular clergymen. We know, and are fully apprized, beloved brethren, that there are thousands who are well disposed, and would obey Jesus Christ; but the thick fogs of theological mysticism, hangs between them and the word of God. These fogs must be rarified by concentrating the rays and heat of truth upon them. 'Well,' says the anti-proclaimer, 'let those who are blinded by these fogs, read the Word of God, without note or comment, and the fogs will soon fly away.' This reminds me of Columbus' setting up the egg: they could all do it after they saw it done, but not before. There is a wide difference between those who are endeavoring to persuade men to read and understand the gospel for themselves, and those who labor, as though no one could understand the gospel, but those upon whom God has conferred special privileges. There is much for the disciples of our Lord to do, in proclaiming publicly, and from house to house, in every neighborhood. Where the word has for sometime been efficiently proclaimed, more or less have submitted themselves to the high authority of the Lord Jesus Christ. They have obeyed God, and not man.

N. J. MITCHELL.

Carlowsville, Ala., Sept. 28th, 1834.

ON yesterday, at my appointment in my own neighborhood, I was, before my congregation, drawing a discriminating line between apostolic advice to penitents, and that given by our moderns. My mind was led to this, from what passed in review before me, a few days since, at a Cumberland Presbyterian camp-meeting. Our *moderns* will tell the penitent to seek Jesus in the grove; (I am not in favor of *grove* worship-*ers*, 1 Kings xviii. 19,) or pray mightly to God, for a pardon of all their sins, &c. But Peter and his coadjutors, would point them to the water, Acts ii. Whilst upon this, the most sublime, heart cheering, and heaven honoring of all topics, an aged lady of seventy-four years, whose former *tuition* was that of a paido, came forward, and demanded immersion at my hands. Think you, that if this application had been made to Peter, (the Apostle of Jesus Christ, by the will of God) in the days of apostolic virginity, he would have proceeded forthwith, upon her confession,—that Jesus Christ was the Son of God,—to immerse her? Or would he have called the brethren together, as jurors, to try the 'orthodoxy' of her application. Query. If *fact* give rise to testimony, and testimony to faith, how can either fact or faith be proved without testimony? Predestinarian—Answer. By feelings. Yes: feelings are relied upon as proof of their faith. Is the father's grief, arising from the report of the death of his son, proof of the fact, that his son is dead? Not at all. Are feelings to be summoned as proof, that an individual has received a pardon of his sins? Not at all. But a full pardon of his sins, will produce rejoicing. Acts viii.

J. A. BUTLER.

A New Case.

CREED vs. *BIBLE.*

OUR readers may recollect that a new Association, formed out of some broken fragments of the old Redstone Regular Baptist, Pennsylvania, was announced some years ago. This Association was composed of some of our partially illuminated quondam brethren, whose physical organization leaned rather to the side of forbearance. They, at all events, disliked William Brownfield, who had been for twenty years judge of Israel elect. Dr. Estep and the Rev. Mr. Allen, of M'Connelstown, Ohio, were principal architects in pitching the new tent. A new creed was proposed by the Doctor and his friends as a bond of union. This creed, amended by Mr. Allen, was last year made "*the declaration of the faith*" of the New or Monongahela Association. It contains only *eleven* articles, so that their faith is not quite half as large as the Regular Baptists, No. 1, of the Philadelphia Confession. Yet weak as it is, it works mightily; for it has already divided the church in Connelsville, and set a number of its best and oldest members adrift for no alleged error, either in faith or practice, except that they were guilty of commemorating the Lord's death, every first day, contrary to the good sense of some of their brethren, who think once a month to be quite sufficient honor and love for the Saviour. I say, for no other alleged error in faith or manners, the new converts to Messrs. Allen, Estep, and Co. have ejected from the kingdom of heaven by virtue of the new order of things, a number of the senior members of the church of Connelsville, of unexceptionable standing in the community, for the crime of showing forth the Lord's death on the first day of the week.

But the following memorial from the proscribed members speaks for itself, to the head and to the heart of every man who will read it attentively:—

Memorial.

TO our beloved brethren and sisters, members of the church of Jesus Christ, at Connellsville;—in a spirit of love and anxiety, to do all that we deem to be the will of our Lord and Master, and at the same time to preserve the union of the body,—we submit as follows:—

It is with regret that we have to call your attention to a fact, well known perhaps to all of you, viz; that there is a difference of opinion existing between some of the members of the church and us, as respects certain duties, which we believe to be inculcated by our Lord in his word. The practice of the first Christians, sanctioned by the Apostles, teaches us, that it is the will of our Lord, that we commemorate the shedding of his blood which was shed for us, and the breaking of his body which was broken for us, on the first day of every week. From the practice of the Apostles we also learn, that it is the will of our Lord, that there be more elders than one in every church. In these two points, some of you differ from us; we are fully persuaded that they are inculcated by the Word of God; therefore we must practise them. This we cannot do without either breaking the established order of the church—obtaining your consent—or separating from you. To the latter course, we cannot reconcile our feelings; nor will we take it, until you make it impossible for us to remain with you, and at the same time, to obey all our Lord's commands;—because you are our brethren in the Lord; be-

cause as such, we esteem and love you; and because we are confident of this, that did you view these things above referred to, in the same light that we do, you would not be less anxious to do them, than we are. We therefore ask you, brethren and sisters, to consent that we, and as many other members of the church as wish to unite with us, may meet together on the first day of every week, to commemorate and to show forth our Lord's death; and to attend to such other duties as he has enjoined upon us in this world. We farther request, that the church elect or suffer us to do it, (the former would be preferred by us,) two or more persons, to perform all things that pertain to the Bishop's or Elder's office.

That you may know the course that we wish to pursue, we state farther—that we desire and design, should our request be granted, to meet with you, and with you to commemorate the Lord's death, at your usual time of attending to that institution; and, on the intervening first days of the week, to meet by ourselves, to enjoy this ordinance; or, with increased enjoyment, if any or all of the brethren and sisters, shall meet and join in fellowship with us. By granting us these privileges, brethren and sisters, you will relieve our minds of a burthen, that has for some time past rested heavily upon us; the burthen which all do and must feel, who know their master's will and do it not: you will save us the pain of either separating from you, or infringing upon the established order of the church: you will give us additional evidence of your love and forbearance toward us; and will, consequently, impart renewed and additional strength to the strong cord of love, that already binds us to you in our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ:—both your Lord and our Lord, your Saviour and our Saviour, your hope and our hope, for life, for death, and for immortality; in whom we trust, brethren and sisters, that we have not to you, made these requests in vain.

—

The above memorial having been presented to the church—by them considered, and the requests therein contained, not being granted,—the undersigned did proceed to practice the weekly commemoration of our Lord's death; for which we have been suspended from the church; the charge brought against us being, not a transgression of any of the commands of our Lord; but simply for acting contrary to the will of the church, expressed in their vote on the memorial. Being by this act of the church, driven to the necessity of travelling our earthly pilgrimage, each one, separate and alone, or of forming ourselves into a church, for mutual help and edification, and for uniting our influence in the cause of our heavenly King,—have chosen the latter. Having long since given ourselves to the Lord, we do now give ourselves to one another, to walk together in obedience to all the commands of our Lord. Believing the Apostle's declaration, that the Scriptures are able to make us wise unto salvation, and that by them, the man of God may be thoroughly furnished for every good work, we take the pure, unadulterated Word of God, as the only rule of our faith and practice; and do pledge ourselves to one

another, to make use of every means which our heavenly Father has placed within our reach, to ascertain what facts are therein revealed to our faith, and what duties are therein enjoined upon us to practise. We reject all creeds, confessions of faith, forms of doctrine, books of discipline, of human composition, with all other doctrines and commandments of men, as bonds of union, terms of communion and fellowship. Declaring our willingness to hold fellowship with every human being who believes that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, the Son of God, and only Saviour of sinners—who has been immersed in water on a confession of his faith—who has repented of his sins, and has manifested that repentance by forsaking them—and who acknowledges Jesus only, as Prophet to teach him, as Priest who offered himself as a sacrafice for his sins, as Advocate with the Father for him, and as King to reign and rule over him.

—

This is, upon the whole, a new case: for it is contended by the new creed party, that the phrase "*as oft as you eat*," &c. grants the utmost license as respects frequency. They, therefore, themselves being judges, limit the "*as oft*" to once a month, and by their law make void the license of the Apostle Paul. Now is it not obvious that in this act the party legislates Paul out of doors: for if Paul now lived in Connelsville; he would either have to vote for once a month, or share the fate of exclusion, and thus be ranked amongst all the evil doers in society, who are unfit for the kingdom of God.

There is no middle ground—no better ground which the new creed disciples can take; for either they suppose themselves the kingdom of Christ, or they do not. If they do not, their profession is all mockery. If they do, then they exclude from the kingdom of Christ by a human law, which makes void the law of heaven. But if they should choose the strange ground that the excluded are still in the kingdom, then are they not guilty of dividing the kingdom of Christ, and making two bodies of Christ instead of one! Viewed in whatever light it may be, the act is full of treason against the constituted authorities in the kingdom of heaven; and I would not for all the creeds of all the councils in Rome, or out of it, be guilty of such a daring insult to the crown and government of heaven, as this new creed has offered. A new church has been the result. The brethren in favor of the Apostles' doctrine have met, organized, and ordained their own elders, and are determined to obey the Lord rather than friends Estep, Allen, and Co. EDITOR.

PROPOSALS

By J. T. Johnson and B. F. Hall, for publishing by Subscription, in Georgetown, Ky., a Periodical, to be denominated THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

PROSPECTUS.

THIS work shall have for its object the recovery of primitive Christianity from the rubbish of sectarianism, and its farther illustration and development in its native simplicity, beauty and excellency. It will advocate that cause in which the Apostles and first Christians labored, suffered and died.

Subservient to this object, the following subjects will be attended to:

1. The Gospel as the power and wisdom of God for salvation, shall occupy a conspicuous place in the Gospel Advocate.

2. The constitution and worship of the first Christian Churches will be shown and illustrated, and a return to their order recommended and insisted on.

3. The Living Oracles, the great arbiter of all religious controversies, will

be advocated as the only means of faith and directory of conduct, as the religion of Christians and system of Orthodoxy.

4. The incompatibility of all Sectarian establishments with the genius and design of the system of faith and practice inculcated in the Christian Scriptures.

5. A notice and review of different publications—the success of the Gospel, &c. &c.

We have been induced to engage in this work from the following considerations: The removal of the Christian Messenger to Illinois, leaves Kentucky without a periodical to advocate the principles of the reformation, and as a medium of correspondence for the brethren. Comparatively few persons in this country take any of the periodicals devoted to the cause of reform, yet many would be induced to take one, if published in the State. One of the Editors is well known to the patrons of the Christian Messenger, having been pleasantly associated with the excellent Elder Stone for the three last years in the publication of that paper. The other is known generally to the brethren, whom he has had the pleasure of visiting in the Western, Southern, and Eastern countries.

Beloved brethren, friends and advocates of reform, to you we look, and from you we expect, aid in our undertaking. While infidelity stalks abroad and boldly calls for the aid of its sceptical advocates to extend its baneful and demoralizing influence; while hydra-headed sectarianism arouses to action the energies of its friends; while sin of every species is supported by the tongues, the pens, and money of those under its influence; while our opponents are rallying their forces and exerting their combined influence to stop the progress of the wide-spreading reformation; shall the friends of the Apostolic Gospel and primitive order, remain inactive? or shall they not exert their best energies in a cause worthy of their support, and come up to the help of the Lord against the mighty?

CONDITIONS.

1. This work shall be printed monthly, on good paper, in numbers containing 24 duodecimo pages each, making in the year a volume of 288 pages.

2. The price of the work, per annum, is *One Dollar*, if paid on the receipt of the first number; *One Dollar and Twenty-five Cents*, if not paid within six months.

3. All who obtain 10 subscribers, and act as Agents, shall have *one* copy *gratis*.

4. All, holding a prospectus, will forward the names of subscribers by the first day of January, 1835. The first number will appear as soon afterwards as possible, provided there be a sufficient number of subscribers to justify the undertaking.

5. All communications to be addressed to J. T. JOHNSON, (Post Master,) Georgetown, Ky.

N. B. Subscribers are requested to be particular in naming the Post-Office, to which they wish their papers sent.

September 10th, 1834.

We cordially wish the above brethren success in these laudable objects. As the Christian Messenger is translated into Illinois, and Brother Johnson, so well known to the brethren in Kentucky, and beloved by them for his ardent devotion to the Lord, his cause, and people; now no longer connected with the Christian Messenger, and being willing to devote his time and talents in conjunction with our zealous and indefatigable brother Hall, in the defence of those great principles, which have made us free; I have too much confidence in the zeal, liberality, and devotion of the brethren in Kentucky, to imagine that they need a single argument, to induce them to sustain the press at home, as one of the most powerful auxiliaries in the cause of Reformation.

EDITOR.

We must devote a good part of the next number to answering queries, of which we have a good many on file. Our appointments from home at this time, and many interruptions, have unavoidably deferred many articles which ought to have appeared ere now.

Conversations in Father Goodal's family circle, have been suspended unexpectedly, but will be resumed in our next.

ED.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Number XI.——Volume V.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Bethany, Va. November, 1834.

Horrors of Heathenism.

EXTENT OF HEATHENISM.

MORE than half the earth's surface is covered with moral darkness. Almost the whole of the vast region of Asia and of Africa, extensive portions of North and South America, together with numerous islands of the sea, belong to the empire of paganism. In its deplorable darkness are enveloped, according to the best authority, not less than 500,000,000 of the human race; and these regions embrace many of the fairest portions of the globe. Nature is no where seen in more lovely attire, and has been no where more lavish of her bounties. In grandeur and beauty of scenery, in fertility of soil, in variety of useful productions, they are exceeded by none on earth. Let the eye of christian benevolence run to and fro through this immense empire of darkness. Truly the harvest is great!

ABSURDITIES OF HEATHENISM IN RESPECT TO THE DEITY AND DIVINE WORSHIP.

1. *Objects of worship.*—More than 200,000,000 of our race, embracing China and contiguous countries, are Buddheits, worshipping a great variety of imaginary deities, paying homage to the spirits of departed ancestors, and to innumerable idols. More than 50,000,000 are worshippers of the Grand Lama, a deified human being. More than 100,000,000, including Hindostan and regions adjacent, are worshippers of the Deity, under three forms, Brahma, Vishna, and Siva, with numberless subordinate deities. The millions inhabiting the various Asiatic and Pacific islands, worship an endless variety of false gods, represented by images in every variety of monstrous and disgusting forms. In different pagan nations, various animals receive divine honors, as the cow in India, various reptiles in South

Africa, the shark among the natives of the Pacific isles, and the crow among natives of the North-west coast. The luminaries of heaven are also deified, as are rivers, and trees, and departed souls of men, and malignant demons!

2. *Their religious rites evince the greatest degradation.*—In some regions they are attended with excessive *cruelties*. "The shark," says Rev. Mr. Ellis, "was formerly worshipped in the South Sea islands. On the occasion of worship, the priests sallied forth, and wherever a company of persons were assembled, a rope with a noose was suddenly and unexpectedly thrown among them, and the first person taken in the snare, man, woman, or child, was strangled, cut in pieces, and thrown into the sea, to be devoured by the shark."

Dr. Buchanan writes: "The horrid solemnities of Juggernaut continue. Yesterday, a woman devoted herself to the idol. The wheel did not kill her instantaneously, as is generally the case; but she died in a few hours. This morning, as I passed 'the place of skulls,' nothing remained but her bones."

Religious rites in some religions are most disgusting. "The car of the chief Hindoo idol," says Dr. Buchanan, "moved on a little way, and then stopped. A boy of about twelve years was then brought forth to attempt something yet more lascivious, if peradventure the god would move. The child perfected the praise of his idol with such ardent expression and gesture, that the god was pleased; and the multitude emitting a sensual yell of delight, urged the car along." The Hindoo gods are represented as examples of every kind of licentiousness, and as pleased with correspondent rites of worship. Their images and the sculpture of their temples, are spectacles of impurity. The whole idol system exerts a most debasing and demoralizing influence upon the mind. What a contrast between paganism and revelation on the grand point, the character of God and the way of acceptance with him!

THE HEATHEN HAVE NO CORRECT VIEWS OF A FUTURE STATE.

This is another affecting feature of their moral degradation. The Chinese and the Hindoos (and theirs is the faith of more than half the heathen world) believe in the *transmigration of the soul*, or its passage after death, from the present body to some other; the good to nobler, the bad to viler bodies. These views involve a mere animal existence after death, and rewards and punishments corresponding to such an existence. Various African and India tribes suppose the future state a sort of continuance of the present, involving similar wants, and perils, and circumstances. Accordingly the grave of the Indian receives also his dress, arms, &c. Retribution to the good will consist of cloudless skies, unfailing verdure, and abundant game, with all the luxuries of sensual appetite; while the wicked are to endure all the torments of ungratified desire in barren lands, abounding with wild beasts and venemous serpents, and darkened with storms and tempests. Without greater particularity on this subject, it may suffice to say, that while we find no pagan nation

destitute of some idea of a future state, we find none whose views are not mingled with extravagant absurdities. While they have been unable to resist the impression of a future life, they have given to a corrupt and disordered fancy, the privilege of drawing such a picture as she pleased.

In respect to *character*, moral debasement is the universal tendency of heathen views of futurity. An anticipated sensual paradise countenances the baser appetites, while the fierce and malignant passions are enflamed by the supposed future rewards of success in war or schemes of revenge. Instead of awing the transgressor's mind and repressing evil deeds, the reverse is the melancholy fact. And on *happiness*, their influence is no less disastrous. By bloody sacrifices of human victims, by unbounded indulgence of hateful lusts and malignant passions, countenanced and encouraged as these are, by absurd views of a future world, the sum of human misery has been vastly increased. How beneficent the hand that bestows that Gospel which brings "life and immortality to light," which sets truly before the benighted pagan's mind the things that shall be hereafter!

VICE AND CRIME AMONG THE HEATHEN.

Under the influence of polluting and debasing views of the Deity and divine worship, of incorrect apprehensions of a future world, and the grinding oppression of despotic rulers, iniquity bursts forth in heathen countries in prodigious luxuriance. Our limits forbid a survey of the great sea of pagan wickedness. The united voice of all who have dwelt among the Heathen proclaims, that none but those actually present to behold them, can have any idea of what revolting scenes of depravity are every day witnessed. Those upon the spot declare the awful picture of heathen abominations, drawn in the first chapter of Romans, is essentially the state of Heathenism as developed before their eyes. Vice bursts over all control, and rolls its waves of corruption on every side. The whole idol system, all over the earth, is full of abominations: it carries its deluded victims down to such a frightful depth of shameless pollution, as renders details too revolting to be endured.

THE MISERIES OF THE HEATHEN ARE VERY GREAT.

1. *Despotic governments* produce incalculable misery. The arm of oppression often strips men in an hour, of the gains of years; thus plunging families, sometimes whole districts, into the depths of poverty and misery. Capricious and sanguinary laws stretch the rod of terror over the enslaved and trembling subject. Property, liberty, or life, must be surrendered at the caprice of a tyrant.

2. *Religious customs* inflict great miseries. It has ever been a favorite pagan notion that suffering was pleasing to the Deity. This is often voluntary, inflicted by deluded devotees upon themselves. The flesh is cut or pierced with instruments, tortured by fire, or emancipated by abstinence from food. A most miserable death is

often the consequence of this infatuation. Some cast themselves upon iron spikes, which inflict deadly wounds; others bury themselves alive in the earth; others sink themselves with heavy stones to the bottom of the ocean; others throw themselves beneath the wheels of idol cars. The funeral pile in India was a dreadful specimen of self-inflicted misery.

"In the year 1799, twenty-two females," says the London Christian Observer, "were burnt alive with the dead body of Unitio, a Brahmin. The fire was kept burning three days! When one or more arrived, the ceremonies were gone through with, and they threw themselves upon the blazing fire! On the first day three were burned; on the second and third days *nineteen* more." "Another Brahmin died near Serampore, who had married forty women; all but eighteen had died before him. On this occasion, a fire extending ten or twelve yards in length was prepared, into which the remaining eighteen threw themselves, leaving more than forty children." In the Bengal Presidency in nine years, from 1815 to 1824, the number of *suttees* (cases of burning as above) was 5,997.

The sufferings by *pilgrimages* in India are immense. More than 300,000 persons have been known to visit a favorite idol in a single year. By disease and want, a frightful havoc of life is occasioned. The London Missionary Register gives the following facts from an eye-witness: "The poor pilgrims are to be seen in every direction dead, or in the agonies of death, lying by fires, tens and twenties; and in some parts there were hundreds to be seen in one place." "I saw one poor creature who was partly eaten, though alive; the crows made an incision in the back, and were pulling at *the wound* when I came up. The poor creature feeling the torment, moved his head and shoulders for a moment; the birds flew up, but immediately returned and recommenced their meal."

3. Their miseries are multiplied by the *want of natural affection*. This principle is weakened, and it seems in some cases totally destroyed. The infirmities of declining life, instead of being soothed by filial tenderness, are the occasion of cruel abandonment; or death is hastened by bloody weapons. "Sometimes, tired of waiting on him, the South Sea native would pierce his aged and unsuspecting father with a spear. Sometimes the children would pretend they were carrying their father to bathe, when they would throw him into a grave previously prepared, stifle his cries, and put an end to his life by throwing large stones upon him."—*Ellis' Account.*

Infanticide has prevailed in almost every heathen country. "Hundreds of helpless children," says Mr. Kingsbury, "have been murdered among the Choctaws. Sometimes the mother digs a grave and buries her child alive, as soon as it is born; sometimes she puts it to death by stamping on its breast, by strangling, or knocking it on the head."

"A Hindoo woman cast her child, between three and four years old, into the Ganges, as an offering to the goddess. The little creature made its way to a raft of bamboos that happened to be floating

by, and seizing one end of it, was drifted along, crying to its unnatural parent for help. She perceiving from the shore the danger of the child's escaping, plunged into the water, tore away its hold, broke its neck, and hurled its life-warm corpse into the middle of the current, by which it was soon drifted out of sight."—*Tyerman and Bennett's Journal.*

4. *Heathen wars are cruel.*—War is horrid enough under all the mitigations of civilized life; but in pagan lands it is carried on with terrible ferocity. Scarcely could unchained demons, bursting from their abodes beneath, make more horrid exhibitions of malignant passions. "The barbarity of wars in the South Sea islands," says Rev. Mr. Ellis, "was dreadful. Here, a warrior might be seen tossing little children and infants into the air, and catching them upon the point of his spear, where they expired in agonies. There, another might be seen dragging in savage triumph, five or six lifeless children by a cord, which had been passed successively through their heads from ear to ear. Yonder, all covered with gore, another might be seen scooping with his hands the blood from the gushing trunk of his decapitated foe, and drinking it with hideous exultation."

5. Their sorrows are multiplied by *indifference to each other's woes.* The most hard-hearted selfishness is generated by heathenism. The sick languish unattended; the poor perish by cruel neglect, or direct acts of inhumanity. "As we passed, we saw a poor man lying dead among the heaps of grain. He had just picked up a few husks of peas and grain, which it appears he had been attempting to eat, but was too far gone. Not a single man in the market would give this poor creature one handful of wheat to save his life."—*Christian Observer.*

"Every Hindoo," says Dr. Ward, "in the hour of death, is hurried to the side of the Ganges, or some sacred river, where he is exposed to the burning sun by day, and the dews and cold by night. Just before the soul quits the body, he is immersed to the middle in the stream, while his relations stand around him, tormenting him in these last moments, with superstitious rites, and increasing a hundred fold the pains of dying. Very often, when recovery might be hoped for, these barbarous rites bring on premature death."

6. *Sense of insecurity* is a great source of misery. Every thing dear in the present world—friends, property, liberty and life, are in constant jeopardy from the rapacity of despots. The storm may burst at any moment, take every thing dear at a single stroke, or repeat its visit, emptying the vials of wrath, drop by drop. The effects of superstition in this respect, especially in Africa, are appalling. "When one of the royal family dies, human blood must flow as an offering to the gods. On these occasions, the princes rush out, seize the first person they meet, and drag him in for sacrifice. While this season lasts, therefore, it is with trembling steps that any one crosses his threshold; and when compelled to do so, he rushes along with the

utmost speed, avoiding every moment the murderous grasp that would consign him to death."—*Discov. and Adv. in Africa.*

7. "*Unrestrained indulgence of the passions* multiplies the woes of the Heathen." The horrid passion of revenge has turned into an utter desolation, rich and populous provinces. Disease, the curse of unbridled lust, had made the most dreadful havoc on several of the South Sea islands, when they were first visited by missionaries. Intemperance, an importation from Christian countries, has frightfully augmented pagan wretchedness. Envy and jealousy, and malice, and remorseless covetousness, contribute also to swell the tide which sends its bitter waters through a large portion of the scenes of social and domestic life.

8. *The miseries of females.*—Humanity weeps at the melancholy picture of their degradation and wretchedness. "I would to God," said a South American Indian mother, "that my mother by my death had prevented the distresses I endure. What kindness can we show to our female children, equal to that of relieving them by death from such oppression, a thousand times more bitter than death? I say again, would to God my mother had put me under ground the moment I was born.—*Cecil's Miss. Sermons.*

"Hindoo females," says the Abbe Dubois, "*are in fact*, used as mere animals. The men regard them as slaves, and treat them on all occasions with severity and contempt. The object for which a Hindoo marries, is not to gain a companion to aid him in enduring the ills of life, but a slave, to bear children, and be subservient to his rule."

"The Chinese peasant," says Malte Brun, "yokes his wife and his ass together to his plough." And Mrs. Judson writes, "So far from receiving those delicate attentions which render happy the conjugal state, and which distinguished civilized from heathen countries, the wife receives the appellation, *my servant* or *my dog*, and is allowed to partake of what her lordly husband is pleased to give her at the conclusion of his own repast."

9. *Savage customs.*—The system of caste in India is one of the greatest scourges which ever afflicted human nature. It is repugnant to every feeling of justice and humanity, and binds a most grievous burden upon millions of the human family. The Taboo system of the Pacific islands was a kindred work of darkness, inflicting a cruel death upon all that broke its absurd enactments. The system of ordeals, or trials of accused persons by fire, water, poison, exposure to wild beasts, &c., is a perfect mockery of justice, and a vast arena of cruelty and misery.

10. *Anxieties and forebodings respecting a future state.*—The vices and crimes of the heathen are so odious, and so contrary to reason and conscience—the law written on their hearts—so destructive to the body and polluting to the mind, and their modes of appeasing the Deity so utterly and manifestly absurd, there cannot but be apprehensions for the future. It is said of the natives of the South Sea islands, that in their dying agonies they would often cry

to their attendants: "There, there stand the demons watching for my spirit! O guard its exit; O preserve it from their grasp!" We cannot doubt that these are painful forebodings in the minds of millions as they contemplate the unknown future; these are whisperings of an immortality; there is conscious guilt, there is consequently anxiety and alarm!

"Their sorrows shall be multiplied that hasten after another God." We have given a mere outline, a drop or two of a great ocean. The cry of heathen degradation and wretchedness is an "exceeding bitter cry;" it is like the voice of many waters; it calls for the alleviating influence of that Gospel, whose inviting voice is, "Come unto me, all ye that *labor and are heavy laden*, and I will give you rest."

—

REMARKS.

SUCH is the picture of the Heathen world, and a very imperfect sketch it is—drawn in one of the tracts now in circulation through this country. The object of the tract is to show that there is no salvation for these unhappy and unfortunate fellow-creatures—filled with "idolatry, uncleanness, lasciviousness, hatred, envyings, wrath, malice, strife, seditions, covetousness, drunkenness, murders, railings," &c; and to excite the sympathies of christendom in their behalf, that they may send the gospel to them. Admit the premises, the whole premises in the tract; admit the plea, the whole plea deduced from them in all its force, and we ask, What gospel shall we send them? Which of the hundred gospels of sectarian christendom shall we send them? Shall we send them the missionaries of popery, prelacy, presbytery, and independency, with their subdivisions —all of them? or one of them? If one, will all the rest support that one?—if all, will all be supported by earth or heaven?

What is to be done? Something, or nothing? If something, what shall it be? This is the question. We say something ought to be done for the salvation of the heathen. We are ready to show what that something is; but no person will make a beginning to do it.

They will not believe Jesus Christ, and they will not believe us. He said, that a house divided against itself cannot stand. "By internal broils any kingdom may be desolated; and no city or family where such dissentions are, can subsist." Satan is too wise to expel and excommunicate Satan, for then how could his kingdom subsist? —So reasoned and so taught Jesus the Messiah. But no sect believes him, unless it can believe that it is *the church of Jesus Christ*, and all without is Pagan, Jew, or Turk. The name of Jesus Christ is blasphemed among the Pagans, the Jews, and the Turks. If there be any truth in the words of Jesus, the heathen cannot be converted by any sect, or by all the present sects of christendom. In his preaching and in his prayer recorded in John xvii, this doctrine is taught, with a clearness and with a force, that no honest and sane mind can misconstruct. He prayed for the conversion of the world in the only way in which it is *possible*. His words are: verses 20—24. "Nor

do I pray for these (my apostles) alone, but for those also who shall believe on me through their teaching, *that all may be one:* that as thou Father, art in me, and I, in thee, they also *may be one in us*, that THE WORLD MAY BELIEVE that thou hast sent me—and that thou gavest to me the glory which I have given them; that they *may be one as we are one:* I in thee, and thou in me, that *their union may be perfected;* and that *the world may know* that thou hast sent me, and that thou lovest them as thou lovest me." This prayer speaks a lesson with the power of God. It teaches the only plan by which the world can be converted. If there were as many missionaries as there are pagans, man for man, they could not convert them to Jesus Christ, while there are hundreds of temples devoted to different gospels, creeds and parties, in the lands where Christ is acknowledged.

The artillery of sectarian christendom is spent against itself. The learning, talent, wealth and zeal, of Calvinists, are spent against the learning, talent, wealth and zeal, of the Arminians, or the Episcopalians, or the Catholics; and so of all the others against one another, and against all. A proselyting sectarian spirit and crusade, are a curse to any land, and not a blessing. If all were united upon the *Apostles' doctrine and ordinances*, the *light* of christianity and its *love*, would melt not only the ice mountains of Siberia, but the golden calves and images of a thousand superstitions. Nothing could stand before a united christian people. They have learning, talent, wealth, and all the moral machinery requisite to batter down to dust every pagan citadel, from the rising of the sun to the place of its going down. The blast of the gospel trumpet, more powerful than the seventh blast of the seventh day of the seven priests of the seven ram's horns, which laid the walls of Jericho in the dust, before the ark of the Lord,—would prostrate every pagan establishment in all the lands of Shem, Ham, and Japhet.

It is the sin of christendom, that there is a pagan altar standing upon this earth. No man can say that he is clear from the blood of all men, who gives a cent or a prayer to build up any sectarian interest in christendom. He that builds up a party, builds up a rampart against the conversion of the world. He that adds a tradition or an opinion to *the apostolic bond of union*, and thereby either makes a new division, or sustains an old one in christendom, does virtually attempt to defeat the prayer of Jesus—overrule the laws of the Almighty—and makes the conversion of the heathen, impossible.

We have preached this doctrine for more than twenty years; we have written in defence of it at different periods for eighteen years; during which time we have been seeking for the *old paths:* and every day's report only deepens our convictions of its truth, and inspires us with new confidence, that we have found the ground, the only ground, on which the brethren in Christ can ever rally, unite, and wage a successful war against Satan and his kingdom.

EDITOR.

The Old Creed's better than the New.

THE CREED CALLED "THE APOSTLES'."

"I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth: and in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried; he descended into hell; the third day he rose from the dead; he ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

I believe in the Holy Ghost; the holy catholic church; the communion of saints; the forgiveness of sins; the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting. Amen."

THE phrase "*descended into hell*" is understood as synonymous with *he descended into the grave*, or *into the place of departed spirits.* The brevity and simplicity of this creed proves its antiquity, and evinces that false philosophy had not then so muddied the waters of the sanctuary as now. In contrast with this, let the reader weigh the 5th and 6th articles of the new edition of the new creed of the new Association of the most regular of the Regular Baptists of the Monongahela Association. It is dated May, 1833:—

"5. We believe that "except a man be born again," by the direct and positive operations of the Holy Spirit in the heart, he cannot be saved, and that all who are thus born again shall be kept by the power of God unto salvation.

"6. We believe the Scriptures maintain the doctrine of election, and we hold it as an *important truth* displaying the sovereignty of God; and yet, that it does not militate against man's free agency or accountability, but that all are required "to repent and believe the gospel."

These believers in *opinions*, rather than in *the testimony of God*, ascribe salvation to being born by "the positive and direct operations of the Spirit." There is no such proposition in the Old or New Testament. Men are said to be saved "by faith," "by baptism," "by grace," by keeping in memory the gospel;" but no where "by the positive and direct operations of the Spirit." *Quere*—Who can explain *the positive operations of the Spirit* upon an unbeliever's heart?! It may be said that positive operations are not negative operations, and that direct are not indirect; but then we are no wiser than before.

Their faith in the keeping of the regenerate is as unauthorized as their theory of *positive* operations. "They believe that all thus born again shall be kept by the power of God unto salvation." There is not one text in the Bible says so Peter says of himself and his brethren that they "are kept by the power of God *through faith* unto salvation, ready to be revealed at the last time." These creed-makers are, however, privileged characters, and they have taken to themselves the right of *making scripture* to prove their opinions. There

are in this creed of eleven articles, out of seven scripture quotations, six manufactured at "the Forks of Yough." There are six quotations in inverted commas, which, with their subjects and predicates, are not to be found in King James' version, nor in any other we have seen.

The sixth article is a blinking of the good old doctrine of the decrees. The Westminster Divines were more candid than these Divines assembled at the Forks of Yough: for while the latter gives the *go-by* to election by a passing compliment, calling it "*an important truth*," the good old Regulars and the Scotch Divines say, "God has decreed in himself from all eternity, all things whatsoever comes to pass;" and "angels and men thus predestinated and foreordained are particularly and unchangeably designed, and their number so certain and definite, that it cannot be either increased or diminished." Is this, gentlemen, "an *important truth*, displaying the sovereignty of God"? "But all," you add, "are required to repent and believe the gospel"! What gospel?—That the elect can neither be increased nor diminished!

This Association lies along the foot of the mountains of Pennsylvania; and this may explain the philosophy of this new creed. But they have fortified it with good strong gates and bars; for by the constitution, "this Association shall always consist of the *pastors* and messengers of the Regular Baptist churches that may be in union with this body." Pastors, then, are constituted members, as well as messengers. See section 1st of the Constitution.

But brief and few as the articles of the new creed are, they are nevertheless too long and numerous for the practice of the churches. The 9th article says—

"We believe the first day of the week to be the Lord's day, by him set apart, and observed by the Apostles, for religious worship, as singing, prayer, preaching the word of life, baptism, and observing the Lord's supper. 1 Cor. xiv. 26. Acts xvi. 13. Acts xx. 7. Acts xvi. 13, 15. Acts xx. 7."

Yet they refuse to observe the Lord's supper on the first day of the week, though set apart, they say, for this observance. Acts xvi. 13. is quoted to show that baptism was one of the purposes for which the Lord's day was set apart! and yet Acts xvi. 13. says no such thing! The Jewish Sabbath is the day mentioned in the passage quoted. But I am, perhaps, interfering with the rights of these believers of opinions to make scripture as as well as a creed, and shall therefore bid them adieu. EDITOR.

Circular of the Black River Baptist Association.

AS a happy contrast with this miserable, blind, and naked creed, we shall, for the honor of the Baptists of New York, present a few extracts from the Circular Letter of the present year, being their 25th anniversary of the Black River Association, containing 3087

members. It does honor to the body that published it. Of such Baptist brethren I am not ashamed. My thanks to Elder Timothy Brewster for presenting me with the Minutes which contain so interesting a document:—

"*Dear brethren*—Being solicitous for the welfare and peace of the churches, and the purity of their doctrine and worship, we beg leave in this our annual epistle, to submit for your consideration *the supreme authority of the Holy Scriptures.* By asserting the supreme authority of the Bible, we mean that the Bible, and that alone, claims entire dominion over our faith and practice in things of religion, and demands our unreserved and implicit submission to all its holy requirements. To these high and holy claims of the word of God, we believe that all Protestant saints readily concede; and what we wish to urge, is, that the principle be fully carried out, and duly regarded in all our churches. Never can the peace of Zion, and the purity of religion in the worship and service of God be fully restored until this is done. Never will Zion appear in her beautiful garments until she fully appreciates this principle. Never will she appear terrible as an army with banners, and with her great King and Leader at her head, spreading confusion and terror among her foes until the word of God gains complete ascendancy over her faith and practice, and she submits entirely to its claims. As the Bible claims to be a light to our feet and a lamp to our paths, as it proposes to build us up and to give us an inheritance among all them that are sanctified, it demands an attention for this end, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn and the day-star arise in our hearts, or in other words, until this state of darkness be past. Who, that prays for the peace of Jerusalem, can but mourn over the evils that distress the dear Zion of God in the world, and the many opposing and conflicting claims that are urged on the world in the name of Christ and religion? Who that has any love for the souls of men can contemplate the various systems of false doctrines and delusions, calculated to lead souls to perdition, without being moved? Who that has any regard for the honor of God and the glory of Christ, can witness the self-exulting and Christ-abasing schemes, urging their way by the impetuosity of a mountain torrent, without having his soul moved within him? And from whence, we inquire, are all these evils, and what is their remedy? The answer is at hand. They have arisen from an inattention to the holy claims of the word of God. It is not, we believe, owing to any ambiguity of the Scriptures, or any mystery enveloped in the doctrine and commands of God, that have led to these painful and unholy results. It is an impeachment of the wisdom and goodness of God, to suppose that he has made or intended to make a revelation of his will to the world, by which they are to be governed in their lives, and be judged in the great day, and on obedience to which is appended eternal life or eternal death, and yet so wrap up its intentions in mystery, and give it in such language as to render the meaning of its holy precepts necessarily doubtful to the honest inquirer after truth. God either has not made full and complete revelation of his will sufficiently clear

to guide us into all duty, or the evil must be chargeable on some other source. We unhesitatingly decide that it is from an unholy cause. This cause is in the corrupt principles of our nature, in the depravity of the human heart, in a spirit of opposition to his will. The Bible presents us with a system of doctrine and duties, harmonizing in all their parts; and when we come to it as a book speaking the mind of God, to read and understand it for ourselves, with a determination to obey its requirements, it is then, and only then, that we are guided into all truth. But an evil of which we complain is, that we come to it with our prepossessions of mind. That which is most pleasing and will best gratify us, we have decided to be right, and it is brought to the Bible to receive its holy sanction. The Bible is made to support our favorite system, rather than our system formed and determined by the Bible. In this way the Scriptures are wrested and made to speak a language unauthorized by their Divine Author. In this way they are made to give their holy sanctions to practices never required by their righteous precepts. Our own inclinations do much, very much in determining our duty, and the course that we take in the things of religion; whereas they have no claim whatever to plead in the affair of duty and religion. The word of God is sovereign in its requirements and decisions, and by it we must be directed, and to it we must implicitly submit all our prejudices and inclinations, or be reckoned among its neglectors and opposers. The Bible has been robbed of the simplicity of its meaning and the clearness of its import, to favor the decrees of councils, support confessions of faith, to build up and support the interests of party, to save from the mortification of the flesh, and redeem the pathway to heaven from the burden of the cross. To these unholy purposes have been employed the labor of pulpits; for them the press has groaned, professed christians have toiled, intellect has been taxed, and the assiduous pamphleteer behind the curtain has delivered his cross sparing charge with the holy grace of honest intention that bespoke a concern for the purity of truth and the glory of God. However much in this way has been saved to the flesh or detracted from the supremacy of the truth—however pleasantly saints have been betrayed into a smile on the doctrine of non-essentialism in the things of religion, yet it should be known and felt that there is a tremendous weight of responsibility resting on churches and individuals in this affair, and happy is the man whose hands are clean and whose garments are not polluted with this flesh-pleasing traffic. These evils are of incalculable magnitude, and appear with their blighting influence in almost every direction to which we turn our attention.

"Professed Christians have done much to bring the Bible into disrepute in the world: one makes it speak one thing, and another its opposite. It is made a forced witness in every sectarian cause, and compelled to give its sanction to every man's way, and thus, like a sheathed sword, its edge is unheeded and its point unfelt, and is rejected by the infidel as an assemblage of ambiguous contradictions; on the same account it loses its power over the conscience of its professed convert to Christ. Its supreme authority is not felt, for its sovereign claims

have not been urged on his mind, as demanding an entire surrender of his will to the claims of the Lawgiver. In the laborious departments of the church, it has in too many instances lost its dominion.

"Again, the supreme authority of the word, and its appropriate place in the reign of grace, is lost sight of in the view of the "lead of the spirit," as that the Holy Ghost, by whom the word was inspired, would *lead* men contrary to its own instructions, and thus contradict its own self, or *lead* to things unrevealed and unknown in the word of God, and thus impeach the perfections of its revelations, and under the supposed sanctions of the Spirit, the house of God loses its order and is filled with confusion and "every evil work."

"The Bible is plain in its instructions, and would designing selfish men leave it to exert its native influence, it never would be otherwise. These denominational and sectarian parties have had their origin in the selfishness and depravity of the heart, and not in the obscurity of the word. Would we all come back and submit to its authority, and adhere to its instructions, as in a case of life and death, they would cease to exist, and our prejudices would soon be lost in the unity of the church. There is a wrong in this affair, and God, the God of the world and of the church, will perceive it, and wo to him or them with whom it is found. God will not furnish the church with the means of converting the world, and allow them to be thus sacrificed to unauthorized purposes, and he approve of the waste. He who departs from the Bible, and builds a separate interest, is responsible for the consequences. Let every man be concerned lest the evil in any wise be attached to him. Let us consult the mind of God in every step in religion, as we would if our eternal salvation was depending upon the righteousness of the move, remembering that by his word we must be judged in the great day of God Almighty. In every thing that we would alter, did our salvation depend on a strict conformity to the decisions of the Bible, let us *now* alter that God may be glorified in our obedience to his *will*, and in prayerful dependence on his Spirit to lead us into all truth, let us submit ourselves unto God, as dear children. Let no man deceive you with vain words, for because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience. Walk as the children of light, proving what is acceptable unto the Lord."

I cannot withhold my *God speed* to the efforts of these brethren to carry out into practice the excellent doctrine above quoted from their Minutes. EDITOR.

QUERIES.

DANVILLE, *Ky.* September 21, 1834.

Quere 1.—PLEASE attend to the following:—"But you are an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people; that you should declare the perfections of him who has called you from darkness into his marvellous light." 1 Pet. ii. 9. This passage is

generally relied on to prove that it is not necessary to have an ordained minister, by and through whom to worship God, and that all the disciples may and ought, by virtue of their office, as "royal priests," to break the loaf on the first day of the week, even in the absence of an ordained minister. But I do not know that it proves it. Perhaps you can throw some light on the subject. I find the same address in substance, and in similar style, made by God to the children of Israel, (Ex. xix. 5, 6.) and yet, immediately after (for we have no reason to suppose that God altered his purpose concerning them so soon) we find him separating Aaron and his sons to the priest's office, by whom alone this same "kingdom of priests" were to worship God and offer sacrifice acceptably.

Query 2.—Rom. xi. 13. "Now I speak to you, Gentiles; (and inasmuch as I am the Apostle to the Gentile, I do honor to my ministry,) if by any means I may excite to emulation my kindred, and may save some of them." The words enclosed in the parenthesis appear to me to represent the Apostle as holding this idea, that he addressed the Gentiles because he held the office of Apostle to them, and that he honored, or was an honor to his office; or that the office was made honorable by being filled by so honorable a person as himself. And leave out the words in the parenthesis, and the sentence seems incomplete. How was his addressing this part of his epistle to the Gentiles at all calculated to excite to emulation his unbelieving Jewish kindred? Thomson throws the latter part of the sentence into the parenthesis also, and makes it mean, as I understand it, that he honored his ministry in proportion as he excited to emulation his kindred and saved them. "For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what will the receiving of them be but life from the dead?" But I would like to hear from you on this passage. If you think the latter worth attention, you may give it a place in the Harbinger: if not, it makes no difference; but the first one, about the "kingdom of priests," I wish you to insert, with your answer; and also, the principal arguments in favor of the sentiment, that the disciples, without any particular appointment, should "break the loaf," &c.

Query 3. I think you have said somewhere in your writings, that the Lord's prayer is unsuited to the present time, or that it is not proper to pray "*Thy kingdom come*," inasmuch as it has already come, and was set up on the day of Pentecost. I was reading the testimony of Luke some time since, and saw, (xxi. 31.) "Know, in like manner, when you shall see these events, that the Reign of God is nigh." Please also to notice this.

SAMUEL AYRES.

Answer to Query 1. "An ordained minister, by and through whom to worship God," is a thought repugnant to the whole genius, and spirit, and letter of the New Institution. Jesus Christ is the only divinely ordained minister by and through whom to worship God. Still, however, it is a question worthy of consideration, whether the passage

in Peter, some times relied on in part proof that the disciples may break the loaf, though none of them has been set apart by ordination to feed the church, be relevant or not to that point. For my part I cannot regard it as dispensing with officers in the Christian church, any more than the passage to which you allude in Exodus xix. 5, 6. dispensed with a special ministry in that "*kingdom of priests.*" There was a ministry over that kingdom of priests, and there is ordained by Jesus Christ a ministry over the new kingdom of priests. That ministry is *a plurality of elders* who have the oversight of the congregation and watch over the flock of Christ. But that their presence or existence is indispensable to the prayers, praises, or *any part of the worship of the family of God*, is not only insusceptible of proof from the New Institution, but directly contrary to the fact that churches did from the beginning exist, and must again exist for some time without these officers; and during which period the brethren prayed, sang praises, and kept the ordinances of the Lord, commemorated his death and resurrection. Whatever constitutes *the worship* of God is the common privilege of all the disciples *as such.* If the breaking of the loaf be a part of the worship of the church of Christ, then the members of it, as such, have the right to break that loaf and drink that cup, as they have to unite in prayer and praise. Hence we find that the disciples broke the loaf *before there was a bishop or a deacon in the kingdom of Christ.* Three thousand one hundred and twenty disciples in Jerusalem continued steadfast in breaking the loaf, and in prayers, and in praises, before the first election of officers took place. (See Acts 2d and 6th chapters.) And the disciples at Troas, *as such*, came together on the first day of the week to break the loaf. The reason and nature of things, as well as the *precedents* found in the Acts of the Apostles, alike enforce this worship as the privilege of all disciples, whether they have elders or not. The Apostle Paul blames not the bishops of Corinth, but the disciples for not observing the supper when they came together in one place on the first day of the week, as the institution required.

But that a church is not set in order to the full enjoyment of all the means of edification, until it has a presbytery or eldership, is abundantly obvious from the letters to Timothy and Titus, as well as from other writings of Paul and Peter.

But no one can more fairly infer that the disciples of Christ ought not, may not, break the loaf of blessing in the absence of such elders, than that the children of one family ought not, may not, eat their own supper because their parents are absent. In such a case some one by common consent will take the lead; and in a young church, by the same common call or consent, some senior brother will preside at the Lord's table, as well as be a voice in prayer, or lead the sacred and social song.

Moreover, it does not appear from any saying in the book, that bishops were ever chosen for the sake of breaking the loaf, nor for the sake of praying or singing in the church. The disciples *commune* in all these acts of worship; and he that breaks the loaf second or last

requires as much authority and devotion as he that breaks it first. [See essays on the Bishop's Office, *Christian Baptist*, under the head "*Ancient Order of Things.*"]

Answer to Query 2. We may thus paraphrase Rom. xi. 13. "I extol the blessings of you, Gentiles, not to lift you up with pride, (I, indeed, do honor to my ministry,) but in order to excite the attention of the Jews to the distinguished favor which you enjoy, and which they have lost by their unbelief."

Answer to Query 3. For my views of "the coming of the kingdom," I refer you to my last Extra. We may pray for the triumphant reign of the Messiah—for that reign which is yet to commence, of which John speaks in the Revelation; but no person, with a common understanding of the five first books of the New Testament, can pray in the sense of the Lord's prayer, for the coming of a kingdom which came 1800 years ago.

JAMES TOWN, *Ohio*, August 14, 1834.

Query 4. Do the expressions, "Not accused of riotous living, nor unruly," apply to the children or to their fathers?

Query 5. Is it necessary that a man have children who have believed and obeyed the gospel, before he can be appointed an overseer in the church? Or should the expression "*believing children*" have been translated *obedient children*, or "having his children in subjection," as it is rendered in Timothy? M. WINANS.

Answer to Query 4.—They most certainly apply to the children—not to their fathers; for in the original the gender and number of these expressions in construction agree with children in gender and number, and not with father.

Answer to Query 5.—The word *pistos*, rendered *faithful* in the common version, and *believing* by Macknight, is susceptible of both meanings. In the same chapter, in the negative form, verse 15, it is rendered in the common version *unbelieving*, and by Macknight *unfaithful*. It occurs nearly seventy times in the New Testament, and is translated more frequently by *faithful* than *believing*. The connexion, (Titus i. 6.) differs not materially from the connexion in 1 Timothy iii. 4. Both imply that the person eligible to the office of bishop should have his children in subjection, that they should be of *christian morals*, and by implication Christians. How children could be in subjection to Christian parents, *faithful*, not liable to the imputation of riotous living or insubordination, and yet not believers, so puzzled Dr. Macknight that he preferred *believing* to *faithful* in the passage quoted. And as the former always implies the latter, we thought it most safe to retain his version of Titus i. 6.

But do we not learn from all that is said on this subject, that a person would be ineligible to this office if some of his children were infants, or if some of them, not members of his family, had renounced the faith, or had left the paternal roof unconverted before he understood the Christian religion and embraced it? But that those under his care, of proper age, should be of christian morals, of good orderly deportment, is, I think, clearly propounded. A man who cannot con-

vert and govern his own family is unfit for the episcopal office, if he have been himself a Christian when he became the head of a family.

Query 6.—Have we a right, in any case, to forbid water on application for baptism? *Dayton, Ohio.*

I answer unequivocally, Yes. If a drunken man, or a person of very suspicious character were to ask for baptism, we should say to him, "Bring forth fruits worthy of reformation." Prove that you are penitent by your works. Indeed, in all cases where the evangelist has reason to suspect ignorance, or any improper motive, it is his duty first to be satisfied on the intelligence and good intentions of the candidate. But when no ground of such suspicion appears, he is in duty bound to immerse every one promptly on his sincere and intelligent confession of the ancient faith. Immersion, without faith and repentance, is *no better than infant sprinkling*. It is according to every one's faith he receives the blessings promised. "He that believes and is immersed shall be saved, but he that believes not" [though he be immersed] "shall be condemned." Jesus Christ did not receive all who professed to believe in him.

Query 7. Has any one a right to church fellowship or privilege by immersion, or is every immersed person to be considered a member of the church before which he presents himself for immersion?—— *Dayton, Ohio.*

Answer. Every one immersed on the confession of his faith is made a citizen of the kingdom of heaven; but he becoming a member of any particular congregation requires something more than his immersion. His immersion must be proved by testimony when it was not seen by the whole church where he applies for admission. Indeed, reception into any church as a member of it, must be on application; and the church to which application is made ought to be satisfied on two points—first, that the applicant has made the good confession, and that since his immersion he has conducted himself in a manner worthy of his profession.

Peter's asking the question, "Can any man forbid water?" implies that it might sometimes be forbidden with good reason. And the Apostle's letters of recommendation, and the testimony which they bore to certain characters in order to procure their admission into particular congregations, fully justifies the judgment expressed in the answers to the preceding questions, as well as our own experience.

Query 8. Ought a brother and a sister (married) be retained in society who separate from each other; the one willing to acknowledge his fault, and the other not willing? *Lincoln county, Ky.*

Answer. The party that satisfies the church by a confession of the fault on its side and by reformation, ought to be retained; and the party who fails in one or both of these respects, ought to be rejected. The party who repents not is then the cause of separation, and must be dealt with as a transgressor.

Query 9. Two disciples have a dispute about a piece of property: each claims it as his; neither can prove his right. They mutually refuse to commune with each other. The church believes both their

assertions. What ought the church to do in such a case?——*Lincoln county, Ky.*

Answer. If the church believe them both to be honest in their views, (for it cannot in any other sense believe their contradictory assertions,) it ought to exclude them both if they will not cease to contend about a matter which they cannot prove, because of the *contention*, however the right of property may be. They virtually exclude each other and themselves too from the church by such a contention. It must, however, be a worse case than that of the two women who contended for the living child, if the congregation cannot decide which is in error. That being decided, the case is easy. That being undecided, both must be excluded until one party yields, or until the church can decide between them.

Query 10. Is a person eligible to the bishop's office who before his conversion was of bad report among them who are without?——*Ky.*

Answer. If by "*bad report*" we understand general bad character, as almost every person understands the passage; such a one is, in Paul's judgment, disqualified to receive the bishop's office. He is ineligible, because however sincere his conversion may have been, his former behaviour forbids his elevation to any conspicuous place in the Christian community. And still much more, if after his profession of the faith he falls into any scandalous sin. The reasons for the apostolic injunctions on this subject must be obvious to all who reflect. No talents, however bright—no acquisitions, however splendid, can atone for bad character, or be regarded as worth one farthing in the Christian kingdom, unless sustained by an unblemished reputation. Purity, and not knowledge—morality, and not eloquence, are of high repute in the kingdom of righteousness. No brother, who before his conversion was of bad fame, or who, since his conversion has dishonored himself by any flagrant transgression, is eligible to the bishop's office, Paul being judge in the case. No moral society, much less the christian church, would hazard its reputation by elevating such persons to conspicuity. If, indeed, they are genuine converts, they will prefer a more humble station.

Query 11. A union was formed some time since in this state, between the disciples of Christ and some churches, who formerly were accustomed to preach much and debate much upon certain metaphysical questions, belonging to the Arian and Trinitarian hypothesis, on condition that they holding Christ to be the HEAD of the church in heaven and on earth, Prophet, Priest, King, Lawgiver, and Judge of all, the only begotten Son of God, would cease to speculate, preach, and debate on such questions, which minister strife rather than godly edifying; but since that time, the tongue and the press have not ceased from such speculations and debates. Query: Ought not the union on such a breach of contract to be null and void.——*Fayette, Ky.*

Answer. These things ought not so to be. Perhaps these brethren if admonished, would desist from it. It would not be expedient nor right, that because one or two may have so acted, that all these

churches should suffer for it. While many excellent christians may not understand all that is written on the *person and glory* of Jesus Christ—of the relations of *Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*—of the *sacrifice* of Christ, and *his sufferings for us*—and of the resurrection of the dead—it would be exceedingly improper and unbecoming for them to speculate and theorize on these subjects. If they are silent when they do not understand, unobtrusive when they cannot comprehend, and willing to obey and honor the Lord in all things, they are not to be repudiated on these accounts. But should they broach and teach the crudities of Arius and Athanasius, and seek to make a party in the congregations of Christ, the case is altered. Take away three ideas out of the New Testament—The revealed revelation of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, the sufferings of Christ for us, and the resurrection of the just and unjust—and you have any thing else but the christian religion. Any one then who explains these away, or weakens their force and influence, sets up a new religion; it may be judaism, deism, or paganism—but christianity it is not. While then I would suffer no man to dogmatize to the weakening of these cardinal truths, these pillars of the christian temple, I would bear with all good feeling that brother, who does not, or who cannot understand every thing written upon them as I do. But if I do not dogmatize, he must not. He must allow me to use and apply every word in the book, in its full and fair construction, and I will do the same with him; but if he is wise above what is written, he must keep his wisdom to himself, till I ask him for it. 'Tis his private property, and I will not tresspass on his premises; but he ought not to place his goods on my premises, without my leave. These remarks, if they transcend the scope of the question before us, it is because other questions from different sources, have been propounded to us on the same subject, or to the same effect. The parties to any covenant should be governed by it; for it is better not to vow, than to vow and not pay. Still however, I am inclined to think from all the premises, that but few are chargeable with such imprudence.

Query 12. Is there any other reason for believing that the 9th and 11th chapters of Zachariah were written by Jeremiah, than that the quotation found in Matthew xxvii. 9, 10? Or, seeing that *that* quotation is from Zachariah xi. 12, and not in Jeremiah, must we conclude that the name of Jeremiah, by some mistake, has slipped into the text of Matthew?

J. A. Butler.

Answer. The Jews said that the spirit of Jeremiah fell upon Zachariah, because of the similarity of his style. It is also said, that the Jews had collected the Prophets in different sections for reading, (as in the Episcopal service of England,) and that the running title of these sections, was sometimes applied to all that section, though the work of different prophets. From the similarity of the style of these two Prophets, and being frequently read together, the Jews were accustomed to quote them under the name of the principal piece in the section. Some of the ancient copies of Matthew simply

read, "The Prophet." Some copyist inserted "Jeremy" in the margin, and thus it crept into the text of Matthew xxvii. 9. The latter is my opinion on the matter.

Query 13. What estimate would be placed upon a man's *character*, in Virginia, and one too, who professed to be "specially called to the work of the gospel," if he should in private, eulogize the ancient gospel, as contended for by yourself and others; and in his public exhibitions, denounce as heretical, and God-dishonoring the whole scheme? Should he be thought characterless in 39 1-2 degrees North Latitude; for *such*, what extenuation could be plead for him in 34? Will you reply, "Give to Cesar the things which are his, and to God the things which are his?"

J. A. BUTLER.

Answer. Such a person weighed in the balances of God's sanctuary, in all latitudes, is found wanting. There are many who improve upon the products of your climate. They sail under the English flag, but are American bottoms, and carry American cannon. They preface their sermons with a few denunciations against some damnable heretics and heresies; and after the preamble, teach our doctrine, and use our arguments. Thus they separate between the soul and conscience. They curse the heretic, and preach the heresy. In the days of Cromwell, the royalists toasted the Protector and drank to Charles. These men have borrowed more from the serpent than from the dove, and more from the serpent than his prudence. They are not fools; and I wish we had equal proof that they are not knaves.

EDITOR.

The Millennium---No. 3.

The Binding of the Dragon.

OUR lay brother is very eloquent on the inability of a corrupt government to renovate itself. Apostacy never stops. He that slides must always fall. Retrograde movements, like revolutions, never change their course. "Does corruption ever purge itself?" These are some of the axioms on which he relies to prove the necessity of the personal and immediate return of the Lord. His conclusions are not, in our judgment, in his premises. Grant all his axiomata, and it would only follow that the physical hand of God must be interposed—that the vials of his wrath must be drained out on the kingdom of the beast. This we expect, and this is all that he can prove from the premises in his commentary. If the Lord must appear in person to put down his enemies and introduce a better era, it must be shown from other documents than these. These we shall examine in due time.

Our present object is first to show that it is neither impossible nor improbable that great revolutions may be effected by moral means

alone, and still greater changes by moral means combined with the judgments of God. The two extremes on this question are moral means alone, and physical means alone. Mr. M'Corkle and the Millenarians plead for the latter, and others for the former.

With all the lights we have upon the subject, we plead for a combination of the two—for moral means and physical means combined. The proposition and the proof, the doctrine and the miracle, the denunciation and the plague.

Let us meanwhile estimate what intellectual and moral means may do, from what they have done. Compare christendom in the year 1834, with christendom in the year 1534. Greater, however, would be the contrast were we to take 1234. Will any man say that things have been growing worse ever since the Protestant Reformation, and that the world is now riper for destruction than it was then? Has there been no retrograde motion during these three last centuries!

A few ideas excogitated by Bacon, Locke, and Newton, have changed the politics, economics, and the whole moral and physical science of half the world, as respects territory. The physical and moral science, derived too, indirectly or directly (it matters not) from the Protestant Reformation, has advanced society ten generations in a single century. A few ideas excogitated by Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius, &c. have redeemed the earth from the grossest bondage and ignorance in all things mental, moral, and mechanical. The triumphs of a few religious and scientific ideas are inscribed upon ten thousand pillars. Monuments more astonishing than the Egyptian pyramids or the Tartar wall, stand on both continents, in many of the islands, cities, and villages—in the wilderness itself—in the vallies and mountains—on the rivers and the seas, indicative of the regeneration of mind, and commemorative of the splendid triumphs of truth over ages of darkness and superstitition. Who can tell what a few more original thoughts on the subjects of religious education and government might effect? The Press seems destined to tear up all sorts of error by the root, and to remodel society after a pattern as novel as overwhelming.

Tens now count hundreds, and hundreds thousands, in the progress of time and its manifold and sublime innovations and revolutions. The invention of gunpowder, the mariner's compass, the printing-press, the discovery of America, the American Revolution—what have they wrought!! *That the Bible may be read and understood by all men*—a proposition which has called forth ten thousand volume ; what magic power has it displayed! And, Mr. Editor, not to flatter yourself and compeers, should you succeed in establishing *five propositions*, which I could select from your *Christian Baptist*, I am persuaded a revolution as extensive and as valuable (to say the least of it) as the Protestant Reformation, would again regenerate and bless the world in ten thousand ways, which neither you nor the most sanguine of your friends could trace out.

This is, of all ages and of all generations, the most unpropitious for the assertion of the dogma that moral and intellectual means can

benefit society in no very valuable nor permanent way. Almost every common newspaper presents insuperable difficulties to such a preposterous opinion. But remember, sir, I go not for moral means alone. I only attempt in my own feeble way to show that moral means *may* do more than we are aware, from what they have actually achieved already. Do I not, sir, reason correctly when I reason from what *was* to what *is*—from what *has been* done to what *may be* done? I claim not the benefit of either arithmetical or geometrical progression, though I cannot see why I should be denied either.

But, sir, I have written at the head of this essay, "*The Binding of the Dragon;*" and the reader will expect that I now say something upon this singular phrase. God works by means. The Spirit informs us that as a prelude to the first resurrection an angel is to descend from heaven.—For what, sir?—To bind and fetter Satan before the Messiah descends!—Astonishing!—Does the King of Kings—does the triumphant Messiah who fought and conquered Satan, in person alone and unsupported in the wilderness of Judea, in the days of his flesh, now require Satan to be bound before he appears on the arena! Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in Askelon, lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice, lest the uncircumcised triumph! that before Jesus the mighty conqueror descends to vindicate his cause and to make it triumphant, an angel must descend from heaven with a great chain in his hand to bind down the dragon, the old serpent and satan, in the nethermost abyss! It cannot be, sir! If the Lord is literally and personally to return to introduce the Millennium, I promise for him that he will never require such an advantage over his adversary. He will not send before him some mighty angel, who is himself an overmatch for Satan, to bind him down to Tartarus to make way for his easy triumph, that he may usher in the glorious Millennium without an opponent.

This single thought seems to me to present an insuperable objection to the whole scheme of the advocates of a literal and personal return of the Messiah, at the time of the resurrection of the martyred saints, which cannot be believed; for, sir, this binding of the dragon is so placed as the precursor to this resurrection, that it must be regarded as *preparative* to it. I see only one way to escape from it; but, as far as known to me, no literalist has ever thought it expedient to hazard it. It is to suppose that the descending angel, with the key of the abyss and the great chain in his hand, is the Messiah himself. Be he who he may, however, it is he that lays hold on the dragon, that old serpent, and binds him for a thousand years.

Immediately after the sealing down of the dragon, John saw thrones filled with saints—a new dynasty indeed! A glorious era when "*saints shall judge the world!*" All the Millennial kings will then be saints. The dragon, secured by the angel of the Lord, disturbs not their reign for one thousand years. Christ reigns over the universe, and the saints reign on earth; and all this subsequent to the binding and securing of Satan: for John saw not the thrones nor the enthroned saints till the angel had locked the prison door. Enough

is said to show that the descending angel introduces the reign of the saints; consequently, the immediate precursors of the Millennium are set forth under the figure of the descending angel with the key of the abyss and a great chain in his hand.

Now unless we know how much power this dragon has *to deceive* the nations, we cannot calculate the consequences of his imprisonment. Were I to assert that this alone is sufficient to give the gospel a triumphant spread from pole to pole in a single year, would all the facts, reasonings, types, and analogies of my brother Samuel M'Corkle be sufficient to disprove it? He might call upon me to prove my assertion, but that is all he could do. He cannot disprove it. Because he knows not but that there may be an adequate cause for that great revolution, and God never did employ any thing more nor any thing less than an adequate cause for any work of his, moral or physical. It is, then, in my judgment, extremely hazardous to plead for the personal appearance of the Messiah to usher in the Millennium, on the ground that all other means are inadequate until it can be shown that the binding of the dragon is inadequate to all the splendid results that are supposed to ensue upon the commencement of this new era.

In these remarks I intend no more than the exposure of the inconclusive reasonings of all the Millennarians—of all who plead for two literal resurrections a thousand years apart, for a literal and personal return of the Messiah to put down the dragon and to introduce the Millennium. I affirm not how much power the dragon now exercises in all the superstitions and delusions on earth; I do not say, though it is to my mind very probable, that the gospel would instantly be an overmatch for all other imposition were this deceiving and infatuating power out of the way. But I say, until it is shown that this would be inadequate to the triumphs of the truth, no one ought to violate the rule of the Roman poet—

> Nec Deus intersit; nisi dignus vindice nodus
> Inciderit.———

In English thus—

> 'Never introduce a god into the poem unless you have found a difficulty which none but a god can overcome.'

No person ought to introduce the Messiah himself into a scene for which an inferior agent is quite sufficient.

Were I, indeed, asked to demonstrate that such an event as that described in securing the dragon is all-sufficient to place the saints on thrones, I should collect all that is said in the volume on the power, cunning, intrigue, and malice of the dragon, exerted against the truth: then I presume it would appear that the removal of all these out of the way would give to the gospel the triumph which we all anticipate. And here, Mr. Editor, I am reminded of a saying of one of your reforming brethren who was making great headway among the Methodists: "O! sir," said he, "if these Methodist preachers were all sent as missionaries to Africa, how soon would the old gospel convert all the Methodists in America!!" This worthy and zealous brother used to

say that "taking a hundred pounds out of one scale was just equal to putting a hundred pounds in the other."

If I am asked for the symbolic import of the beginning of the 20th chapter of the Revelation, I ask the reader to accompany me through the 19th chapter. Towards the close of it, and before the commencement of the 20th chapter, he will observe that the Prophet has before him "the great supper of God," a supper at which all the birds of prey are guests, and feasted upon the flesh of kings, commanders, captains, and their armies—that after the overthrow of all the despotisms and corrupt hierarchies figured under the beast and the false prophet, and their being cast into the lake which burned with brimstone, he saw a messenger from heaven descending to secure and restrain for a thousand years the dragon, symbol of all despotic power—that spirit which tyrannized in the Egyptian, Assyrian, Persian, Grecian, Roman governments, and all the sub-monarchies, aristocracies, and republics that arose out of their ruins. This spirit, this satanic dynasty of dynasties, which in all ages has stood up against God's rightful sovereignty and supremacy, being completely put down by a power derived from heaven, set forth in the descending angel of the Lord, there arises the new dynasty of the saints sitting on all the thrones of all the nations of the world.

To prevent the mistake of my friend Samuel M'Corkle and others, the Prophet says that the persons who received judgment, or the sceptre, were (not men raised from the dead—but) the SOULS of them who had been beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, &c. who never did succumb to any authority in religion but that of the Messiah. These are the *spirits* that now reign with Christ, support his supremacy, acknowledge his official glory and personal dignity, defend his principles, and rejoice in his salvation.

"The rest of the dead," the tyrants and firebrands of the earth, the spirits that supported the dragon, revived not again till the thousand years were expired.

I need not, in the usual prosing way of many commentators, go into an explanation of all the imagery of the vision, as if my readers had not five grains of sense themselves. I need not tell them that the abyss means the sea—that the sea is the symbol of confusion and war—that the key and the chain with which the angel were furnished were not literally forged out of iron; and that the dragon was not a literal serpent, nor the angel descending from heaven a literal angel—any more than a literal throne, a literal soul, and a literal resurrection of saints literally dead, who lived four, five, or six thousand years ago.

I exhibit no more than the grand idea—the import or moral of the passage of this scenic representation of things. And, indeed, the burthen of this paper is only to show that the *context* of the resurrection in debate furnishes an adequate cause for the introduction of the reign of saints on all earthly thrones, and the triumph of the gospel over all lands, without the necessity of the Messiah reigning literally in Jerusalem for a thousand years.

From heaven the power descends, the judgments of God, the vials of his wrath accompanying the proclamation of the apostolic gospel, as the miracles of that age accompanied the preaching of the Apostles. This combination of physical and moral means seems all sufficient not only for the imagery of the vision, but also for the work to be done. And he that adds to the means necessary to the end, neither honors God nor himself.

Those who preach a hell of brimstone and a lake of fire, drawn from the scenes of this vision, properly belong to the literalists, who, with my friend of the "Signs of the Times," choose to select a chapter in the Apocalypse, and arbitrarily divest it of its scenic character, and read and interpret it as the moral law written on two tables of stone.

As an additional argument to that drawn from the 1st, 2d, and 3d verses of this chapter, to refute the literal application of the 4th and 5th verses, I will add another drawn from the 7th and 8th verses. And will not Samuel M'Corkle himself yield that the 5th and 6th verses must be understood figuratively if I show that the context, both before and after, are susceptible of no other than a figurative application!

These verses affirm that when the thousand years shall be accomplished, "Satan shall be loosed from his confinement, and he shall go forth to deceive the nations which are in the four corners of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together for war, whose number is like the sand of the sea." The adversary will be released—the nations remote from the central focus, Jerusalem, will, like the extremities of the body, first grow cold. The nations will be deceived—a new tyranny will appear; for the spirit of war has gone abroad. Then appear Gog and Magog. Who are these? I answer, not the literal Gog and Magog of the Jewish people; but as Sodom, Egypt, and Babylon, as well as the souls of them beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, have all revived, so will the Gog and Magog of Ezekiel revive after the thousand years shall be expired. Magog is reckoned among the sons of Japhet, Gen. x. 2. But Ezekiel uses Magog as the name of the country over which Gog reigned. Michaelis thinks that Magog denotes those vast tracts of country to the north of India and China which the Greeks call Scythia, and we Tartary. The Arabs call the Chinese wall *Seid Yagog et Magog;* that is, *Agger Gog et Magog*. This is my view of the matter. The Tartars are now, and long have been, the only people that fill the outlines of Ezekiel's picture. These, in combination with the bands of Gomer and Togarmah, with troops from Persia, Ethiopia, and Lybia, constituted the invading and plundering hosts of Ezekiel. That the Gog and Magog of John cannot be these is not to be disputed, but a people *like* them. Hence as the Egypt, Sodom, Babylon, Gog and Magog of John denote only states, and cities, and people, like those literally so called, I argue that *the souls of those beheaded for Jesus,* who are to fill the millennial thrones and to be the judges of the millennial period, will consist of a race of men *like* them, as the Gog and Magog of the context be-

fore us resemble the Gog and Magog of Old Testament history. It is referred to the reader to say, whether we might not, with the confidence of my friend M'Corkle, now assert that there is no foundation for the theory of a literal resurrection of the saints at the commencement of the Millennium in the 20th chapter of the Revelation; and if not there to be found, we are sure he cannot find it in any other book, Old Testament or New. This subject may, however, be still farther illustrated as we proceed with our examinations of the prophecies.

A REFORMED CLERGYMAN.

Conversation in Father Goodal's Family Circle, at Mr. Reed's.

[*Continued from page* 358.]

Mr. Reed.—OUR friend Williamson being so distressed as to be absent during the remainder of the evening, and as he expressed some interest in our conversation on the *two witnesses*, I think it would be expedient to defer that subject till another opportunity, and introduce a new subject.

Father Goodal.—And what shall it be?

Mrs. Fowler.—As all are silent, I will propose a question; but should it not be acceptable to the company, I will yield the point to another.

Mr. Reed.—Say on, sister Fowler.

Mrs. Fowler.—As Mr. Williamson's case has greatly astonished and rather confounded us all, and as expressed by some of the company, there appears to be a sort of Babel confusion in the religious world, I would wish to be better informed on the causes which brought about this state of things. The Bible seems to be an intelligible book, especially the New Testament; and although there are some prophecies in it, and some things hard to be understood, yet, in the main, it appears to be a very plain narrative kind of volume, which one might generally understand without great difficulty. The question, then, which I would propose, arising out of all these premises, is, *How did this confusion and difficulty in religion begin?* Perhaps if we knew how it began, we might know how to get rid of it, and be relieved from all the perplexities of our own time.

Mr. Reed.—The company appear so interested in the question you have proposed, that, I doubt not, it will prove acceptable and entertaining to us all. And to excite the attention and secure the interest of the junior part of the company, I think we will interrogate some of them, and have them to take part in the conversation. I shall therefore leave it to Father Goodal to introduce the subject.

Father Goodal.—My rule has always been when catechising my family, to begin with the most easterly person in the room, if I could find him out, and so proceed to the West with the course of the sun.

My daughter Maria, then, I think, bids fair to have the honor of answering the first question. The question before us, if I rightly understand it, is, *How originated confusion and difficulty in religion?* To bring this matter fairly before us, I would ask my daughter Maria how she would proceed in instituting an examination of this sort?

Maria Goodal.—I would endeavor to find out the first controversy that ever happened on the subject, and having discovered what that was, I should think it would be easy to find the right side of that question; which, being decided, I would endeavor to trace all the meanderings of the opposing tenet: for if, as I have been taught, all truths are connected together, and only parts of one great whole; error being the contrary, must be resolved into as many parts as there are particular truths, and all these particular errors must be traced to one common root.

Mr. Reed.—That certainly would be a very rational and philosophic course; but that would require a more elaborate examination than our present opportunity can promise.

Father Goodal.—Let us not decide too hastily, brother Reed. I will put the question round—*What was the first controversy in religion of which you have heard?* Will all the company in order express their views without the formality of being asked?

Robert Fowler.—The oldest controversy of which I have read, was between Moses and Pharaoh, about whether the God of Abraham or King Pharaoh had the better right to the Israelites.

Mr. Payne.—The oldest controversy of which I have read, was between Job and his three friends, whether a good and just man could be as much afflicted as Job was.

Mr. Cunningham.—If I might be allowed to infer from the statements in the first eight chapters of Genesis, the first controversy was, whether a good man might not marry a beautiful lady if she were not quite so good as himself. And it appears that it was decided in the affirmative; for some excellent men, called "the sons of God," took to them the daughters of men, of all which they chose, because they were beautiful.

Mr. Fowler.—I incline to the opinion that the first controversy about religion was between Cain and Abel, and it was about the altar and atonement. It appeared that Cain was an Arian, and had no faith in *sin offerings*; but that Abel was a Calvinist, and believed in *atonement* by blood.

Thomas Goodal.—I agree with Mr. Fowler in his opinion.

William Goodal.—I am of the same opinion with my brother Thomas.

Mrs. Fowler.—I rather think that the first controversy was between Satan and Eve about the true meaning of God's commandment.

Mrs. Reed.—I go with sister Fowler.

Mr. Reed.—And I must follow my wife in her answer.

Mother Goodal.—I must go a step higher than my friends on my right hand, and express it as my opinion that the first controversy about religion was between Satan and Michael whether God ought

not supremely to be loved. I own this is an inference; but as the company have not kept within the narrative, but employed their powers of inference, I must infer that some leading angel withstood Satan in his allegation that he ought to be regarded as well as God, because next to him in dignity and presidency.

Mr. Reed.—Father Goodal, it has come round to you, and if you express an opinion of your own, we shall have no umpire; for I discover that two or three of the company decline expressing an opinion on the matter. Will Father Goodal be umpire in the case.

Robert Fowler.—But here is Maria Goodal, who has not expressed any opinion on this question.

Maria Goadal.—I have answered one question already; and, of course, am equal with all the company.

Father Goodal.—But on this subject we have not heard you, and we must not be over-righteous in such matters.

Maria Goodal.—I must, then, concur with sister Fowler.

Father Goodal.—If we are to keep within the record, I must go with my daughter Fowler; though I will not say but Mother Goodal may be right if we extend our conjectures beyond the human race. But let me tell you that I think we have mistaken the question: for in my opinion the first controversy amongst Christians, and not the first controversy in the world, is the question before us.

Mr. Reed.—Since we have rambled over so large a field, and a greater number of us have concurred in the opinion sanctioned by Father Goodal than in any other; permit me to ask what was the nature of the controversy about the commandment debated by the Serpent and Mother Eve?

Mrs. Fowler.—I understand that Eve contended that God meant literally what he said, that in transgressing the commandment they should die; whereas Satan urged that it was not to be understood as it read; but that it meant something else.

Mr. Payne.—That is worthy of remembrance; for it appears in the sequel that Eve was right, and well for her and her children had she practised what she preached, or acted according to her own judgment.

Father Goodal.—But to return; let me ask what was the first controversy agitated in the Christian religion? And as some of the company have changed position, we shall begin with Thomas Goodal.

Thomas Goodal.—The first controversy of which I have read in the Christian church was between the Jews and Samaritans.

William Goodal.—I think the first controversy was whether infants, who were of Jewish birth, ought to be circumcised.

Robert Fowler.—It was between the Jews and Gentiles; but as it appears to me, that was not the question. I have thought the first controversy between them was whether Gentiles ought to be received into the Christian church at all.

Mr. Payne.—I have read somewhere that the first controversy about doctrine in the Christian church was between the Gnostics and the Anti-Gnostics. The Gnostics, who interpreted the Scriptures by the philosophy of Pythagoras and Plato, delighted in finding remote

meanings in Scripture and censured their opponents for being too low and literal in their interpretations. Their doctrine of genealogies, or processions, or emanations in the Deity, and the malignity which they ascribed to matter, caused them to represent Christ as much inferior to the Father, and as not literally *human;* for matter was so full of evil that they could not admit it to have any residence in the person of Christ.

Mr. Cunningham.—The first controversy, as it appears to me, which happened in New Testament history was about *baptism*—whether the baptism of John was from heaven or from men. And connected with this was the question, Who was a lawful and proper subject of it? The Sadducees and Pharisees contended for it, on the right of *genealogy;* whereas John administered it on profession of *repentance and reformation.*

Mrs. Fowler.—There appears to me much plausibility in some of these views. But I am nevertheless of opinion that the first controversy and the great controversy was among the Jews themselves, and the only one which seemed to occupy the nation for three or four years to the exclusion of every other great question. It was, *Whether Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah.* After his death and burial the next great controversy was, *Whether he rose from the dead;* which was, indeed, only a change of the first question.

Mr. Fowler.—I am constrained to follow my wife; for really I see nothing else debated in the narratives of the four Evangelists but this question.

Mrs. Reed —I, also, must again concur with sister Fowler; for although I discover sundry other questions debated in the gospel history, they are all subordinate to this one, and resolvable into it.

Mr. Reed.—And I must again follow my wife, not because she is my wife, but because she speaks my sentiments.

Maria Goodal.—I once thought that, in the natural order of things, and from some circumstances in the history, the first question was, *Whether John were the Elijah that was to come first;* but then I see that, how important soever that question might be, it comes to the same point—*Whether Jesus was the Christ.*

Mother Goodal.—I am happy to agree with so many of my children in their views of this subject, and have nothing to add but my concurrence with them in opinion.

Father Goodal.—Seeing no general concurrence in what I understand to be the true answer to the question, I proceed to inquire for the application to the subject in hand.

Mr. Reed.—I am pleased with the mistake committed on the first proposition of the question: for I discover a remarkable coincidence which I never before saw, and but for the mistake of the question I might never have seen. The first controversy, at the beginning of the first creation, was about *the word* the Lord had spoken to Eve. The first controversy, at the beginning of the new creation, was also about the WORD OF GOD. The *meaning* of the first commandment was the substance of the first debate; and the *meaning* of the person and

appearance of Jesus *the oracle* of God, was the substance of the second great debate. From the wrong decision of the first question sprang all the corruption in human nature; and from the wrong decision of the second question sprang all the corruptions in the Christian religion. I see there is still more sound philosophy in sister Maria's test of truth than I at first imagined.

Mr. Cunningham.—I must request a little explanation here. Will Mr. Reed please explain how all the corruptions of human nature and religion could arise from such remote matters?

Mr. Reed.—The first oracle or command of God to man was in these words: "Of every tree of the garden eating thou shalt eat, or thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day thou eatest thereof, dying thou shalt die, or thou shalt surely die."

Mr. Cunningham.—Allow me to interrupt Mr. Reed. In our Scotch Bibles this is not the first commandment. In Gen. i. 28. we have a prior commandment—"Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it, and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth."

Mr. Reed.—So it reads here; but still in reference to our inquiry, the first commandment with promise and with threatening; or the first commandment concerning life and death given to man, is that which I have given from Gen. ii. 16, 17. in which chapter Moses resumes the subject of man's creation and location. If it were worth debate, however, I would undertake to show that the words in the 2d chapter were prior to those in the first; because in the first chapter Moses only gives the outline of the whole creation; and in the second chapter resumes the history of man; and as proof of this I would urge that in the first chapter we have no account of the creation of Eve; and to have given orders to Adam to "be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth" before Eve the mother of the human race was created, would not be quite so congruous. But this is askance our object, and to return—Satan and Eve entered into debate upon the words "*Thou shalt surely die.*" The Serpent said, "You shall *not* surely die;" and he gave his reasons. He did not deny that God had so spoken to man; but that he did not mean what the words fairly imported was the jet of the controversy. The Serpent's construction of the words was, "God does know that in the day you eat thereof, *then your eyes shall be opened*, and you shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." The Serpent spoke some truth in his comment upon these words; for their eyes were opened, and they did discern both good and evil; and if such were the advantages of the *gods*, or angels, they so far became like them; but his point was to show that the words did not mean what they said concerning death. It is probable, too, that the Serpent eat of the fruit before her; for it is added, that "when she *saw* that the tree was good for food," (which indicates that she had seen it tried,) she heard, believed, and obeyed the Serpent's interpretation, rather than the plain, obvious, and fair import of the

words. And I add, that she seduced her husband; and that when he thought it *expedient* to hearken to his wife rather than to God, the ruin of our race or the corruption of human nature at its fountain was completed. Add together the misconstruction of the Serpent and Adam's yielding to expediency rather than to what is written, and then you have the fountain of all corruption.

Father Goodal.—I verily think, so far as my recollections extend, that I never knew an error broached that did not begin with, "This does not *mean* so: it says so, but it does not mean so:" and I never knew a person presume to transgress a positive law, or withhold obedience to some wholesome requisition, but began his plea with, "I thought it was not *expedient*." "It does not *mean* so;" or, "It is not *expedient*" are the preface to all transgressions and delinquencies.

Mr. Payne.—Like the old English writs, headed "*Nisi Prius*," "*Venditioni Exponas*," &c. &c. You would, then, head all transgressions and delinquencies by, "*It does not mean what it says*," or, "*It is not expedient.*"

Father Goodal.—I speak now from my recollections; for this view of the matter is rather new to me, that all my observations confirm this as the true source of all error in doctrine, and immorality in practice. But, brother Reed, I have interrupted you.

Mr. Reed.—I only intended to have added that the first Christian controversy, or the first controversy in the history of Christianity, being, as has been concluded, the wrong decision of that question, "is Jesus the Messiah," has uniformly issued in infidelity or in corrupt religion; both of which have proved fatal to mankind. He that decides that Jesus of Nazareth was an impostor or not the Messiah, is an infidel ruined forever; and he that decides that he is the Messiah in any sense but the true sense, has a religion founded in error and a religion which cannot———

Mr. Payne.—I beg your pardon, Mr. Reed. Are there two senses of the word *Messiah?* I never knew that any one did, or could, admit Jesus to be the Messiah in a wrong sense!

Mr. Reed.—Yes, there are some who believe that Jesus is one sent from God, and one anointed by the Spirit of God, in some sense superior to Moses, Elijah, John the Baptish, or any prophet or angel; but do not regard him as THE SON OF GOD—GOD'S NATURAL OR OWN SON. 'God has many sons,' say they; 'for such were the magistrates of olden time styled, and the great repositories of the ancient oracles; but only in this sense, though in a higher and more respectable degree, is Jesus the Son of God.

Mr. Payne.—Then, perhaps, I am one of these. I believe, sir, that christianity is a rational thing, submitted to my reason, and that what is not accordant to my reason is not a part of a religion that came from heaven.

Mr. Reed.—It seems, then, that from your own case, and from mine, that there are at least two senses of the word *Messiah;* for I believe that Jesus of Nazareth is the only natural Son of God, and that all others, prophets, seers, magistrates, or saints, are only *honorary*

sons of God. God has but one Son—the only begotten of the Father—his proper Son.

Father Goodal.—Take care of your terms! What do you mean by the phrases, "*natural Son of God*," "*honorary sons of God*"?

Mr. Reed.—I mean the Son of God by nature, and the sons of God by adoption.

Mr. Payne.—I do not understand this. I would request a discussion of this matter, if you please, Mr. Reed.

Mrs. Fowler.—I am sorry to interrupt the company; but the hour of adjournment has come.

Maria Goodal.—I would request the application of our conversation to the point in debate before we adjourn.

Mr. Fowler.—Sister Maria will please not press that matter at present, as we are not prepared for it. As a matter of great interest to me is now before the company, I will solicit a full development of Peter's confession, "*Thou art the Messiah, the Son of the living God.*" But I beg leave to present a note received this evening from our friend and brother, 'Squire Baxter:—

"*James Baxter* tenders his Christian compliments to the whole company at brother Reed's, informing them that himself and wife have arrived safely home from their visit to Bristol, England, and that they request the favor of all the brethren and friends of Newtonfields to spend the afternoon and evening of the 9th instant, at his family mansion, Newton Mills.———*January 7th*, 1830."

Father Goodal.—I then move, that after commending ourselves to the Lord, we adjourn to meet at brother Baxter's, at the time appointed. EDITOR.

Episcopal Recorder vs. the New Version.

NEW VERSION DEFENDED—*No. X.*

OUR candid censor, *Mr. Smith*, of the Episcopal Recorder, has not yet condescended to let his readers hear our defence against his imputations of some mischievous design in the New Version. Our readers have heard, through our pages, all that he has written on all the specifications of such design, presented in his numbers of February 1st and 8th of the present year. We have not finished all that we intended to say on this subject; but having got through with all his instances of the emendations affecting his allegation, and other matters pressing upon us, we intermitted our series of essays; expecting, with some dubiety, however, that in his candor he would be as faithful to his readers as we had been to ours. After some weeks the gentleman informed his readers that we had written some twenty pages on the subject; but inasmuch as we had not published his preamble to the charges alleged, he could not *see* with what propriety he could be called upon to republish my defence; stating, moreover, as far as my

recollections witness, (for I have not his paper before me,) that the main part of his censure was in said preamble.

This honorable expedient, and apology for his withholding my defence, induced me to re-examine said preamble to see what in it required my attention. Thinking as I then did, and still do, that it contains not a single period that is an honor to Mr. Smith, nor a dishonor to me, I cannot find a reason for such a plea. But that my readers may have a full understanding of all the art and management of our opponents, I will lay before them the said preface to his censures, accompanied with a few notes at the bottom of the page:—

"Remarks on a new translation of the New Testament.

"The version of the Sacred Scriptures into the English language, commonly used in this country and England, is one of unrivalled excellence. No translation of the Scriptures into any language was perhaps ever made by so large a number of pious and learned men, none probably was ever marked by an equal degree of careful, patient and laborious research, in its preparation, or of beauty and excellence in its execution. It was made by nearly fifty [1] individuals, (distinguished for their piety and their profound knowledge of the Hebrew and Greek,) who were divided into six companies, to each of which a portion of the sacred volume was committed for translation. 'In the first instance,' says the Rev. T. H. Horne, 'each individual translated every book which was allotted to his division. Secondly, the readings to be adopted were agreed upon by the whole of that company assembled together, at which meeting each translator must have been solely occupied by his own version. The book thus finished was sent to each of the other companies to be examined; and at these meetings it probably was, as Selden informs us, that 'one read the translation, the rest holding in their hands some Bible, either of the learned tongues, or French, Spanish, Italian, &c. If they found any fault, they spoke; if not, he read on.' Farther, the translators were empowered to call to their assistance any learned men whose studies enabled them to be serviceable, when an urgent occasion of difficulty presented itself. The translation was commenced in the spring of 1607, and the completion of it occupied almost three years.'

"The success attending the labors of these great men was even greater than might have been expected, and the translation which they have given to the world has been the theme of admiration among the learned, the occasion among the pious of unbounded gratitude to the Fountain of all wisdom for this bright reflection of his truth. For more than two centuries it has retained the confidence of Christians wherever the English tongue is spoken, and no attempt to supersede it has been attended with the slightest degree of success.

[1.] A hundred men, at least as learned as they, and I would add as great and as good as they, and still more independent, have, in the capacity of commentators and critics, found, and justly too, more faults and errors in the said version than the number of persons employed in making it, were they multiplied by all the orders of clergy in the Episcopal Church. On this subject it never has been a pleasure to me to say much; but put me to the proof, and if I cannot bring names as revered as any of the forty-five or six actual translators of King James, offering more emendations than there are days in the year, I will give up the matter to Mr. Smith. And does not Mr. Smith know that the best commentators and critics in his own church are constantly offering amendments and corrections on the text of King James! Some of his superior clergy, who eulogize the common version as Mr. Horne has done, do nevertheless find many errors in it, themselves being judges. Of this, more in its proper place.

"To the list of these abortive efforts [2] is to be added a publication from the American press, of which the third edition has recently attracted our attention. It professes to contain '*the sacred writings of the Apostles and Evangelists of Jesus Christ, commonly styled the New Testament. Translated from the original Greek, by Doctors George Campbell, James Macknight, and Philip Doddridge. With prefaces, various emendations, and an appendix, &c. By A. Campbell.*' We call this a new translation, because the EMENDATIONS of Mr. A. Campbell are so numerous and important, that he ALONE is responsible for its character. The conspicuous appearance of the names of Dr. Campbell, Macknight and Doddridge, is calculated to deceive the unwary reader, and stamp upon the work a value which it does not possess. [3.]

"The translation of Dr. Doddridge interwoven in his paraphrase of the New Testament, differs but little from the common version; his 'exceptions,' to use his own language, 'seldom reach further than the beauty of a figure, or at most the connexion of an argument.' Dr. Campbell's translation of *the Gospels*, and Macknight's of *the Epistles*, differ more widely from the common version, but not materially; they have never been published except in connexion with their *notes*, [4] which are generally thought the most valuable part of their respective works, and have had but limited circulation. With their unadulterated writings we are not however at present concerned, our chief object being to call attention to some of the professed 'emendations' of Mr. A. Campbell, and thus enable the public more correctly to decide upon the merits of his work.

[2.] "Abortive efforts"! They are not yet abortive, Mr. Smith. There is no version that could be made by all the clergy in protestant christendom that could not be made abortive by some cynic like yourself. The common version would itself have been abortive, even after those fifty *non-such* translators of yours had finished it, had it not been for acts of Parliament, and fines and pennances. Now as we can have no Acts of Parliament here, it is probable that every new version will be abortive so long as the American government exists; but abortive only so far that it will not be acknowledged by those who are either exposed or censured by it. We never aimed at superseding the King's version in your sense of the word; but only in giving to the people a version by which they might better understand the King's version, and have the liberty of reading which of the two they preferred. We wished, in one sentence, that the laity might have what the Methodists call a *chance*, a fair chance with the clergy; and as the pulpits are filled with critics, who are always translating for themselves when their text requires mending, we wish the laity to have a chance to criticise a little by the fireside for their own benefit and satisfaction too.

[3.] "Is calculated to deceive." It did not, then, it seems, deceive Mr. Smith. And how it could deceive any person of ordinary reading intelligence, who reads the prefaces and appendix, is not the most evident proposition in the world. The title-page, even as quoted by Mr. Smith, is positive evidence that his remarks upon it are calculated to deceive; for the title-page tells the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth; and Mr. Smith can show neither misstatement nor deception in the matter. In the first edition of the work we noted all the variations with the words for which they were substituted, in the appendix. This we thought unnecessary in the third. And in the *fourth* edition, as stereotyped, and of which now sundry editions have been printed, we have, for the sake of making the volume as cheap as the common version itself, including the extra matter, left out nearly the whole appendices to the third edition. Is this calculated to deceive?

[4.] "They have never been published except in connexion with their notes." Mr. Smith is not more unwarrantable in this assertion than in those which I have noticed; but in this I can more easily convict him of false statement than in the others; because this is a question of *fact*. It is not a fact, then, which he asserts: for the version of Campbell, Macknight, and Dod-

The reader has now before him the preface to the specifications which I have quoted from Mr. Smith, and on which I have animadverted in the preceding numbers. He may now read this preamble, and see how far it justifies the *expedient apology* for his withholding from his readers my strictures on his allegata.

We are sure, however, if Mr. Smith knew how to dispose of the matter honorably to himself, he would publish my replies. And my reason of assurance in this case he has himself given me in the following extract from his last paper received at this office. He thought there was something in my last Extra he could play off to advantage with his readers; and let the reader see how eagerly he has seized the opportunity. When the reader has examined the following extract with his usual perspicacity, I put to him the question, Would not Mr. Smith have as eagerly noticed my replies on the New Version if he had found so happy an expedient for turning them to advantage? Read the following, gentle reader, and then say:—

"Another point deserves a passing notice. Mr. Campbell characterizes a portion of those who oppose his 'new version,' as those *'who love kings.'* It must be a bad cause which requires a resort to such charges for its support, and we should not have deemed it worthy of notice, had it not been for some remarkable expressions in Mr. Campbell's 'Extra to the Millennial Harbinger, No. VII.,' in which, with strange inconsistency, he avows the very sentiments which he charges upon his opponents. We quote a few sentences to show *upon whom* this charge, if it must be made, is to rest.

" 'In these last days of degeneracy, republics are great blessings to mankind, as good physicians are blessings in times of pestilence; but yet it must be confessed that it would be a greater blessing to be without plagues and doctors. While men are however so degenerate, and while selfishness and injustice are so rampant in society, republican officers are better than kings—because we can get rid of them the sooner," &c.

" 'Monarchy is the only form of government, however, which nature recognizes. It was the first, and it will be the last. A government with three or thirty heads is a monster; and therefore the beast which represents it comes out of the sea with a plurality of horns as well as heads.

" 'The most approved theory of human nature and of human government now current wherever the English language is spoken, either in the old world or the new, is, that a monarchy would be always the best government, because the cheapest, the most efficient and the most dignified; provided only that the crown was always placed on the wisest head and the sceptre wielded by the purest hands. Could we always secure this, we would all be monarchists; because we cannot, we are all republicans.'

"We read that when the children of Israel became degenerate, God in his wrath gave them a king; but Mr. Campbell reverses this order and makes the government of a king a blessing, peculiarly adapted to the condition of a pure and uncorrupted people. This comes nearer to *loving kings* than any thing which we have ever read in an American author, political or religious."

It would insult the good sense of my readers, who have read the Extra, No. 7, to attempt to expose the attempt at deception practised upon the Episcopalians by this distortion of my words from the subject to which they are applied. EDITOR.

---

dridge was published in London, in one volume, without their notes and criticisms, before I attempted it in the United States! It was read too in England within the diocess of the Bishop of London—but not by act of Parliament. So far, however, it made abortive the King's version in Mr. Smith's acceptation of the term.

A Sermon

ON THE MODE OF CHRISTIAN IMMERSION,

By Alexander A. Campbell, *of Tennessee, Minister of the Gospel.* 24 *pages* 12*mo.*—1834.

"MUCH stress has been placed on the baptism of the Eunuch by Philip, to prove immersion; but without any shadow of grounds. In the words of the text the simple fact is stated that he was baptized, but no intimation whatever is here given *how* it was done.

The going down into, and coming up out of the water, were mere circumstances attending the transaction, and were no more a part of the baptism than the riding in the chariot to the place; and for aught that here appears, we have as much right to suppose it was performed by sprinkling, pouring, or any other manner, according to the various meanings of the word baptize, as that it was done by immersion.

Were it not for such expressions as 'going into the water,' 'in Jordan,' 'coming up out of the water,' &c., I apprehend we should never have heard of Christian baptism being performed by immersion.

Although John Baptist's baptism was not Christian baptism, yet it was performed according to the law and the prophets, to make straight the way of the Lord; and if it was done in any other manner than by sprinkling, which was the way the law and the prophets pointed out, he would not have made the way straight. Nor could our Saviour have been baptized by him in any other way; for then he would neither have fulfilled the law, nor have been a Priest according to the law, which it was necessary for him to be, though of the order of Melchisedec, and he would have spokon incorrectly when he said, 'It thus becometh us to fulfill all righteousness.' If he was immersed the righteousness of the law would not have been fulfilled; and not fulfilling the righteousness of the law, he could not be a *legal* Priest under the law; consequently, could not have redeemed those that were under the law; for it was necessary for him to fulfill the *ceremonial* law, that as a Priest without spot or blemish, by his perfect obedience, he could magnify and make honorable the *moral* law.

As my object is to point out the scriptural mode of baptism from *scripture*, and not from the *traditions* of men, it will be proper to examine those words which lead men to *infer* immersion; and to show that when correctly understood, no such inference can be drawn. It is clear that neither the original writers, nor the translators of the Scriptures, intended to convey any such idea; but only to record the simple *fact*, *where* the transaction took place."

The reader will find the substance of the whole sermon in the preceding extract, which contains Mr. Campbell's exordium. According to this erudite gentleman, there is no way of learning from the *New Testament* what christian baptism is. Neither the prepositions in the original, nor in the English version of them, nor the word *baptizo* can possibly determine whether any one ever was immersed or sprinkled by the authority of John or Jesus. "In Jordan" does not mean *in* Jordan, but *at* Jordan—"Coming up out of the water," means only coming *from* the water—"Going down *into* the water," means only going down *to* the water—"*Baptize*" does not mean either sprinkle or immerse, but whatever any one pleases!!! For *his* part, he learns with infallible certainty from the law of Moses and the Prophets, and from them only, that it means to *sprinkle*. Because both blood and water were sprinkled by law, therefore John who

was a Levite, and Christ who was a Priest, both commanded and authorized sprinkling. The law ordained sprinkling of blood and water; and as John the Baptist was a Levite, and received his baptism *not from heaven*, but from the law of Moses, he must inevitably have sprinkled only. And as Jesus Christ was a Jewish Priest, though of the tribe of Judah, concerning which tribe Paul says, "no man gave attendance at the altar," and "of which tribe Moses said nothing concerning priesthood," he must have sprinkled. Most certainly a greater than Paul or Moses is found in Tennessee! Jesus Christ was not a Priest on earth; for if he were on earth," said Paul, "he could not be a Priest" according to law. But Mr. Campbell says, he as a Priest dare not baptize any other way than by sprinkling, for he would thereby have made void the law!!! Yes, and the Prophets too; for the Prophets said, "So shall he sprinkle many nations." Now if he did not sprinkle, but immerse, he would have made the Prophets void. What a pity that this said gentleman did not understand Hebrew, for then he would have read Isaiah lii. 15. "So shall he *astonish* many nations. Before him kings shall shut their mouths." Or, according to A. Clark, D. D. Junius, and Tremelius, "Many nations shall look at him with admiration, and kings before him shall shut their mouths." But I should rather have said, What a pity that he does not understand *English!* for then he could not have said that John could not make *straight* the way of the Lord by immersing, but that sprinkling did actually remove every crook and make every rough path plain!

Some of my correspondents have wished me to review said sermon; but I must candidly, and faithfully, and good naturedly say, that there is nothing in it to review, except the most barefaced simplicity or duplicity; for it would require a Solomon to decide whether the writer of it was the superlative of simplicity or knavery. Such an outrage on common sense, on common English, on Scripture, fact, and reason, I never saw from a Presbyterian Minister. There is no man of any pretensions to erudition, who has an ounce of reputation, that would not be afraid to risque it upon the authorship of such a treatise on the "*mode of baptism*," unless laboring under some inveterately morbid excitement. I could have wished that the author had not been sprinkled or "*christened*" Alexander A. Campbell.

EDITOR.

P. S.—On the last page there is one truth which ought to be credited to the author:—"There can be but *one* scriptural mode of baptism; and if immersion is that mode, sprinkling is not; and if sprinkling is that mode, immersion is not, and cannot be Christian baptism." p. 24. The only exception to this sentence (and I would there were one sentence in the book inexceptionable!) is, that to talk of the mode of immersion by sprinkling, or the mode of sprinkling by immersion, is most ridiculous and romantic. Baptism means some action or no action. If it mean no action, then it is nothing; if it mean the action called *immersion*, it is folly to talk of immersing a person by the mode of sprinkling; if it mean the action called *sprinkling*, it is equally fantastic to talk of sprinkling a person by the mode of immersion.

If the idea of immersion ever entered the soul of a Greek, or if there be a word in that language which expresses definitely and certainly that idea or action, it is *baptizo*. In this I am happy to have the concurrence of all *translators*, critics, commentators, and lexicographers, ancient and modern, of any standing, in all parties. See my note, Fam. Test. Appendix, p. 85. That single note, with the facts it contains, will rebut and refute a hundred thousand pamphlets like this before me.—*Ed.*

Gift of the Holy Spirit---No. 7.

IN ascertaining the import of the phrase, "*The Spirit bears witness with our spirit*," we quoted Dr. Macknight as asserting that "by the Spirit's witness we are to understand;" whereas it ought to have read, "By the Spirit's witness we are *not* to understand a particular revelation to individuals." This typographical mistake was not noticed till after we sat down to write the present essay. It was implied, if not distinctly stated in our last, that the phrase "spirit of adoption" indicates those filial dispositions which are engendered in the believers by the Spirit of God, and that to be "*led by the Spirit*," is, in our style, to be guided by what he says to us.

The phrase now before us is, "*Grieve not the Spirit.*" In the common version of the Scriptures, God is said to have been *grieved* for forty years with the manners of the Jews in the wilderness. Ps. xcv. 10. Heb. iii. 10. 17. Again, the question is asked, (Ps. lxxviii. 40.) "How often did they grieve him in the desert?" Jesus also is said (Mark iii. 5.) to have been "grieved at the hardness of their hearts." From these scriptures we may easily perceive the meaning of *grieving the Holy Spirit*. As Israel of old grieved God in the desert, so Christians may grieve the Holy Spirit by suffering corrupt communications to escape their lips, or by disobeying his precepts.

Children grieve their parents by their foolish behaviour, and Christians are figuratively said to grieve the Spirit when they act in a way unbecoming his presence with them. The Lord was present with the Jews in the wilderness, therefore they could grieve him. His Spirit is in the congregation, and therefore Christians may grieve him. The Spirit when grieved with Adam, forsook him—when displeased with the Jews, it forsook them. David, when conscious of his faults, prays, "Take not thy Holy Spirit from me!" and the command, "Grieve not the Spirit," implies that Christians may also be forsaken by God.

"*Quench not the Spirit.*"—This phrase, like the preceding, is found but once in the New Testament—1 Thess. v. 19. The gift of the Holy Spirit having been like a flame of fire, this figure is most expressive and beautiful. Referring to those gifts extraordinary, enjoyed by many of the first converts, Jewish and Gentile, the Apostle could, with all propriety of metaphor, say to them who had any spiritual gift, "Quench not the Spirit," "despise not prophesying," &c. And

to Timothy, in the same style, he could say, "Stir up the gift which is in you." The word used in Timothy is *anazopurein*, blow up this fire—*quench it not*—put not out this sacred fire in yourself or in others, but rouse it to a flame.

To "walk in the Spirit," and "live after the Spirit," are, in effect, the same as to be "led by the Spirit." Christians who think, speak, and act according to the gospel, are walking after, or according to, the Spirit—living according to the Spirit—led by the Spirit. Thus the Platonist was led by Plato—walked according to Plato—lived as Plato directed.

"Strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man." Eph. iii. 16.; or, "Mightily strengthened by his Spirit in the inner man." Paul implores this blessing from God upon the Ephesians. There is much to be learned from the prayers of the Apostles, both for themselves and their brethren, as to their views, their practical views of the influence and aid of the good Spirit of God. That they expected some help from God of some sort, is clearly and fully expressed in all their petitions, both for themselves and for one another. Let the reader, intent on understanding the Apostles' views and style, carefully examine their prayers, as if to learn what they expected to be yet done for them. The following specimens will be sufficient to our present purpose:—

"On this account I bow my knees to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, from whom the whole family in heaven and upon earth is named, praying that, according to the riches of his glory, he would *grant you to be mightily strengthened by his Spirit in the inward man;* that Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith; that being rooted and founded in love, you may be completely able to apprehend, with all the saints, what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height—even to know the love of Christ which surpasses knowledge, that you might be filled with all the fulness of God. *Now to him that is able to do exceeding abundantly beyond all that we can ask or think, according to the power which works effectually in us*—to him be glory in the congregation by Christ Jesus, during all the endless succession of ages. Amen."

That the Apostle expected the strengthening of the faculties of the mind, by the Spirit of God in the hearts of these saints at Ephesus, cannot be doubted; but that this was to be effected by faith—by Christ dwelling in the heart by faith, is not to be questioned. If such petitions were necessary in the age of spiritual gifts, they are no less so in the present time; and that the Spirit of God does in some way by faith work in men both to will and to do, and that he does and may do for us above all that we ask or think, is not to be questioned, if Paul in this passage is to be understood according to what we call common sense.

The *thanksgivings*, as well as the petitions of the Apostle Paul, imply all this and more. When he heard of the faith and love of the Ephesians, he said, "I cease not to give thanks for you, making mention of you in my prayers—that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the

Father of glory, *would give you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him; that the eyes of your understanding being enlightened, you may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance among the saints, and what the exceeding greatness of his power in relation to us who believe, according to the working of his mighty power which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places*, far above all government, and power, and might, and lordship, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come," &c.

The Apostles taught the Christians by precept or example to pray for the following things:—For eloquence and boldness for those who labor in the word and teaching; for wisdom for themselves; for favor, mercy, and peace for the brotherhood; for the healing of the sick; for an offending brother; for being filled with the knowledge of the will of God; for their own strength and that of their brethren; for the good behaviour of the brotherhood; for the protection and salvation of kings, governors, and all sorts of men; for every promised blessing, and for every necessary thing, either for the present or the future; for themselves and for their brethren.*

These apostolic prayers are full of edification: they are, in comparison of mere didactic communications, as experiment to theory, or as example to precept. The views of the Apostles on the subject of divine influences will be found in their petitions, supplications, and thanksgivings. That they expected much in answer to their prayers, and that they and their converts did not ask in vain, need not be argued to those who will carefully examine this matter.

But the phrase "*communion of the Holy Spirit*," will still more fully illustrate their views. It is *koinonia*, fellowship, joint participation. We have this word twenty times from the day of Pentecost to the close of the Epistles. It is twice applied to the Holy Spirit, 2 Cor. xiii. 13. Philip. ii. 1. It is applied to the Father and to the Son, 1 John i. 3—6. 1 Cor. i. 9. We have the communion of the Father, the communion of the Son, and the communion of the Holy Spirit, or the fellowship of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; for it is the same term uniformly in the passages quoted. The communion of saints; of the blood of Christ; of the body of Christ, denote their joint participation of the influence, presence, and comforts of the good Spirit of God.

We have communion with one another when we mutually give and receive consolation, whether in sentiment, in sympathy, in communication, or in any of the blessings of society. Man was made for communion with God and his fellows, but he lost it in Adam the first. In Adam the second he is restored to that communion; but while in his mortal body his communion with God is only by his Spirit through Jesus Christ our Lord.

*Will the curious and inquisitive attentively consider the following portions of the apostolic writings? James i. 5. v. 16. 1 John v. 22. Col. i. 9—11. Eph. vi. 19. Phil. i. 9, 10, 11. Rom. i. 10. Col. iv. 12. 1 Thess. v. 25. 1 Tim. ii. 1. Heb. iv. 16. 1 Pet. v. 10. 1 John v. 14, 15, &c.

But we have not yet caught the precise idea expressed in the Apostle's benediction—"The communion of the Holy Spirit be with you all!" There is suggested in this phrase a participation of the Holy Spirit *common* to all the members of the body of Christ. It is not some gift or special influence of the Spirit, imparted only to a few; but that fellowship of the Spirit which, under Christ, is common to the many—to all the family of God—of which the Apostle spoke. The best definition of the word *communion* which I can give, is, *union in that which is common.* Wherever there is union in common, there is communion. As the glory of the Lord equally filled all the tabernacle and the temple, so the Spirit of God animates, consoles, and refreshes the whole body of Christ. These consolations, joys, and refreshments from the presence of the Lord, the Apostle imprecated upon all the Corinthian converts. He wished them a full fellowship, an equal participation of those measures of the Holy Spirit which belonged to the body of Christ as such. The three greatest blessings which Paul could invoke on the Corinthians, were, "the favor of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit." These are not one and the same idea; but three distinct ideas—as distinct as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. He that enjoys the favor of Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit, has all the fulness of God, and is as blessed as mortal man can be.

Into these relations to the Father, to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit we are immersed; for the Lord commanded the believers to be immersed *into the name of the Holy Spirit* as well as into the name of the Father and the Son. To be immersed into the name of the Holy Spirit, prepares for the enjoyment of this communion; as being immersed into the Father, introduces into the enjoyment of the love of God; and as immersion into the name of Jesus Christ, introduces us into the favor of the Lord Jesus. This love, grace, and communion are the superlative glory of the Christian institution. They are equally apprehensible, though in their nature and modes of development incomprehensible. It is the duty, honor, and privilege of Christians to enjoy all that into which they are immersed. There is as much wisdom or folly in disparaging the communion of the Holy Spirit, as in undervaluing the love of God or the favor of Jesus Christ.

There is also as much reason, and scripture, and honor in being immersed into the Holy Spirit, as into the name of the Lord Jesus. Should any one think that the communion of the Holy Spirit has ceased, he may as well imagine that the love of God has ceased and that the favor of Jesus Christ is extinct. If he cannot comprehend the one, he cannot comprehend the other. But as we are immersed into the name of the Holy Spirit, we must look for and constantly expect the communion of that Spirit, as well as the love of God and the favor of Jesus Christ our Lord.

There yet remains the phrase "*sanctification of the Spirit.*" This understood, I presume the whole New Testament phraseology on the subject of the Spirit will be easily understood by every attentive read-

er. The original phrase is *hagiasmos pneumatos*, and is found only in 2 Thess. ii. 13. 1 Peter i. 2. In both places it appears to refer to the sanctification of the spirit of believers. It is literally rendered '*sanctification* (or holiness) *of spirit*.' There is no article in the original and no epithet that suggests the Holy Spirit in either passage. God has chosen men to salvation through (or by) holiness of spirit; not through the holiness of his Spirit, but through the holiness of their spirit. When Jesus prayed (John xvii.) for the sanctification or holiness of his disciples, it was *through the truth:* "Sanctify them through the truth; thy word is truth." The belief of the truth is, therefore, by Paul associated with this holiness or sanctification of spirit. The Spirit of God is frequently denominated in these days, "*the Sanctifier*." Let it be granted that it is the Spirit that sanctifies or separates men to God, still it must be argued from the Record that he sanctifies them only through the truth or gospel believed. A sanctified unbeliever is inconceivable; and, as "without holiness (or sanctification of spirit) no man can see the Lord;" so, without faith, there can be no holiness, and no action acceptable to God.

All persons sanctified to God to any high office or function, were anointed, and thus consecrated to his special service. So all christians, being priests, are anointed or sanctified by the Holy Spirit through the obedience of the truth, and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus, cleansing their consciences from dead works to serve the living God. In this we find the secret of the most usual epithet of the Spirit. It is the Spirit of holiness, because it is the Spirit of truth. It is the Holy Spirit, because by its influences it makes us holy; and these influences which sanctify are always by and through the truth. When God chose men to salvation, it was through sanctification of spirit; and as a means to this, it was through the belief of the truth. We shall now attend to any queries upon these premises.

EDITOR.

The Form and the Power of Godliness.

James Town, *Ohio*, October 27, 1834.

Brother Campbell,

SOME men write their sermons, and then read them to their congregations; but when I write, I am willing that all should read for themselves. I shall, then, select a few words found in the Apostle Paul's second letter to Timothy. When speaking of the *last days*, he said there would be some "*having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof*." Whether the Apostle had reference to the last days of the Jewish polity, or to the last days of the dispensation delivered to the Gentiles, I shall not pretend to determine; but have concluded that the prophecy fits the present time, perhaps, as well as any time that has preceded. The Apostle speaks of *godliness* as having a *form* as well as *power;* but states that some who have the

form will deny the *power*. Our present inquiry will be relative to the *form of godliness*. This same Apostle, in another place, speaks of the "*form of sound words;*" and in another place he calls it a "*form of doctrine;*" or, as translated by some, "*the mould of doctrine.*" This *mould* being of God, all who are cast in it, or shaped by it, may be said to have the *form* of the *mould*, or of *godliness*. But some deny that the *form* which they received from the mould, or the impression made by the mould, has any power in it. All who deny that the impression made by the *gospel*, or *word of God*, as delivered by the Apostles, *has power to save*, are of the number who have the form, but deny the power. How many are there in *these days* who deny that the *impression* made by the gospel is the *power of salvation?* Hundreds and thousands there are *now* who deny that the *gospel* is the *power* appointed of God for salvation. They say that the *Holy Ghost* is the power of God for salvation, or that God saves men and women by the *Holy Ghost*, and not by the *gospel*. If *these* be not *they* of whom the Apostle has spoken, I am willing to acknowledge that I know not of whom he did speak.

But to speak more fully of this matter: In *the form of sound words* delivered by the Apostles, *baptism for remission of sins* is enjoined on all aliens who desire to become subjects. And the observance of the *Lord's supper* is enjoined on all the subjects of the King. But there are hundreds and thousands *now* who deny that there is any power in these forms* which were delivered by Jesus and his Apostles. Surely those who have or retain these *forms*, and deny their *power*, are the very ones of whom the Apostle spoke in our text.

But I have heard of some preachers who differ from me on this text. They suppose that the Apostle had allusion to *shouting*, or *crying aloud*, as being the *power* of the *form of godliness*. But I shall now submit this to the judgment of my readers.

Yours as ever, M. WINANS.

PROGRESS OF REFORM.

WE have not space in the present number to publish the documents on hand, which generally appear under this head. We can now only treat our readers to a short extract from a very long and most interesting communication from the venerable *William Jones*, of London, now in his 73d year.—Brother Jones' celebrity is co-extensive with his numerous learned and valuable works, which have been so extensively read both in the British Empire and in the New World. Since the commencement of the present century he has published the following works:—

Theological Repository, 11 vols. 12mo. 1800—1805.—Christian Advocate,

*They divide God's commands into *externals* and *internals*, and speak of the *externals*, such as *baptism* and the *Lord's supper*, as having no power in them. But when asked if the building of the *Ark*, the offering of *Isaac*, the building of the *Tabernacle* and of the *Temple*, were not all external—they answer, Yes. So also is the feeding of the hungry, the clothing of the naked, the visiting of the sick, &c. But all these, according to the division of *externals* and *internals*, being *externals*, are without power—mere non-essentials.

3 vols. 8vo. 1809—1811.—New Evangelical Magazine, 10 vols. 8vo. 1815—1824.—New Baptist Magazine, 2 vols. 1825—1826.—Baptist Miscellany, 5 vols. 1827—1832.—Life of Rowland Hill, 1 vol. 8vo.—Life of Dr. Adam Clark, 1 vol. 8vo.—M'Clean's Works, with his Life and Posthumous Sermons, 7 vols. 8vo.—Biblical Cyclopædia, 2 vols. 8vo.—Lectures on the Apocalypse, 1 vol. 8vo.—and Ecclesiastical History, 2 vols. 8vo.—in all, *thirty-five volumes.* His last works, (viz. Lectures on the Apocalypse, 1 vol. 8vo. and Lectures on Ecclesiastical History, 2 vols. 8vo. just from the press,) have been forwarded to New York for me, but not yet received here. The publication of these last works our brother says, "has greatly impoverished me." So soon as received here and read, we are requested to express our candid judgment of their merits. This we shall do with pleasure. Meanwhile we present our readers with the following extract from his favor of the 3d September, 1834:—

"Critchill Place, Hoxton, London,
September 3, 1834.

"MR. A. CAMPBELL,

"*My highly esteemed and much honored brother!*

"I have, for several years, earnestly longed for a correspondent in the United States, with whom I could compare notes, exchange minds, and confer on a subject which I trust has a prominent place in both our hearts. viz. the advancement which the kingdom of our Redeemer is making in the world. When the Lord, in his wonderful providence, sent our beloved brother, *Mr. Peyton C. Wyeth*, among us, about a year ago, I "was as one that dreamed," and blessed God that he had, at length, answered my prayers and wishes, by opening up a channel of communication between me and the disciples of Christ beyond the Atlantic. It was at my particular request, and under my own roof, that he addressed to you the letter, under date of the 12th Nov. 1833, which you were so kind as to answer on the 1st April, 1834—a copy of which answer is now before me. I must tell you, before proceeding further, that our brother Wyeth, whose health was not very good, left us and went over to Paris, about three months ago, to prosecute his studies, and where I believe he now is. Your letter to Mr. Wyeth has been much circulated among our Scotch Baptist churches, throughout England, and Scotland—to whom it has been the means of communicating very interesting information respecting the progress of the gospel in your far distant land, and in so doing "has been abundant also by many thanksgivings unto God."

* * * * * * * * * *

"With respect to the state of the churches in this country, I trust that, upon the whole, they are upon the increase. Two new churches have risen up lately—one at Leeds, in the county of York—the other at Anstruther, in Scotland, both of which are organized with their Elders and Deacons, and increasing in number. The church in Paisley, which has three elders—Watson, Shanks, and Taylor, received 40 new members during the first three months of this year—they are now between two and three hundred. The church at Nottingham, which I lately visited, have had about 20 added during the last three months—their number is now 200. During my stay there I obtained much information respecting the state of matters among the English

Baptist churches throughout the midland counties, and find that great dissatisfaction almost universally prevails with the existing order of things. The eyes of men are opening to the unscriptural constitution of their churches—the one man system—and they are ripe for a revolution.

"As to our *national* affairs, the newspapers will furnish you with ample materials for thought and reflection! The tables of both houses of Parliament have groaned under the load of petitions for putting an end to the alliance between Church and State—and the clergy, from the episcopal bench to the humble curate, are "gnawing their tongues with pain"! The ministers of the crown are at their wit's end to know how best to steer their course between Scylla and Charybdis; and another year will, in all probability, bring on a crisis which shall decide the fate of the hierarchy. In the mean time, voluntary church associations are formed in Scotland and England, for the purpose of enlightening the public mind, by means of small tracts—public lectures—and other scriptural methods—and thus is truth marching through the breadth of the land, and exposing anti-christian corruptions. How cheering the reflection that "the Lord reigneth"—that all things are under his guidance, control, and management; and that we know the issue will be most glorious—that Babylon shall fall—that she shall sink as a mill-stone in the mighty ocean—and come into remembrance no more! "Let the children of Zion be joyful in their King"—praise his faithfulness and truth, for what he has done; and beseech him to perfect his work!"

"WILLIAM JONES."

Lexington, Ky., Oct. 4th, 1834.

YOU possibly have heard of the division of the Mount Vernon church, brought about by the expulsion of the clerk and myself; by whom it may be asked—for what cause? Just for opinion's sake; not for any immorality, for we were never charged with any. Dr. Fishback was continually harping upon his old worn-out subject of faith alone for justification or remission of sins. We believed in faith, repentance, and baptism for remission. He says, 'to be born of water does not mean water, but means doctrine.' We believe, to be born of water, means to be immersed in water. He believes in two baptisms: one for the Jew, and one for the Gentile. We believe that the Jews were baptized for the remission of sins as well as the Gentiles, and the Gentiles as well as the Jews. He does not believe in baptism for the remission of sins at all; 'for it is,' as he says, 'by faith alone.' Now, brother Campbell, for inviting a man to Mount Vernon, who preached as we believe the ancient gospel without the consent of the King, was the great offence, yes, the 'treasonable offence', as he expressed it, that was the prime cause of our expulsion. Four days afterwards, we constituted a church of twenty-five members that withdrew from the Doctor. We now number about fifty. The two first meetings after our being constituted, the Doctor had ten or twelve innocent females (part of them widows,) expelled the church, for no other cause than thinking differently from him, and for putting those thoughts to practice. It does seem to me, that of all persons upon earth, we ought to treat females, especially sisters, with more kindness and tenderness: widows too, with large families, without a male to instruct them, to advise them, to comfort them in their troubles and misfortunes, than any other characters. Are we not commanded in Holy Writ, to visit the widow, and aid them in their difficulties? That being the fact, would you call turning females out of a church, for pla-

cing themselves in a situation where they would be free from the tyranny and bondage of man, and to be abused into the bargain; I say, would you call such conduct, visiting and comforting them in their trials and misfortunes? For one, I must say, that no christian man would be caught in the act of holding up his hand for the expulsion of ten or twelve females, whose moral and religious characters will stand a comparison with the like number of females, in any part of Kentucky. The abuse and slander that have been heaped upon us all by the Doctor and his followers, you have no conception of; but I forbear for the present. Brethren J. T. Johnson, Palmer, and Hall, have instructed us much in the ancient gospel. They yet preach for us, to our great satisfaction and happiness. We have had great difficulty in getting the use of Mount Vernon meeting house, to worship our God and Father in. The occupancy of meeting houses by opposing parties in my opinion, is a great drawback to the progress of the reformation, in Kentucky at least. I wish you or some other brother would in your next number, propose some plan that would settle the difficulty speedily: could you do it, you would have the thanks of many of your brethren and friends.

JOHN CURD.

Jonesborough, Tenn., Aug. 27th, 1834.

THE good cause is gaining ground here, against all opposition. I have immersed eighty-seven into the kingdom, in less than three months. The ancient order is what they are endeavoring to imitate.

JOHN WRIGHT.

Health of Children---Early Rising.

RISING early is a habit which it is of high importance to fix in children; and in forming it there is far greater facility than in most other cases. There is a natural propensity in children generally to early rising, which needs only to be gratified and encouraged. They usually retire to bed some hours before their parents; and at daylight, or at least at sunrise, are generally awake and anxious to rise. Many of them are actually bred up with difficulty to the habit of taking morning naps, which, when once formed, generally prevail through life. Let the father deny himself so far as to retire early, and become an early riser also. His health, enjoyments, and usefulness, he may depend upon it, will be perceptibly benefited. Long-lived persons have been found, after an extensive inquiry, to resemble each other in this important practice. And this may be connected with another preventive of disease—active employment.

The morning is the season for activity: the frame invigorated by repose, is prepared for exertion, and motion gives pleasure. The pure atmosphere, so much more bracing than at other hours, so much sweeter, and more exhilarating than the air of a confined chamber, has been prepared to be breathed; and, like all Nature's medicines, it is superior to any which science can produce. Early rising and early exercise might more properly be called *food* than *medicine*, as they are designed for daily use, and to protect us from disease rather than to remove it. Every thing, except mere sloth, invites—nay, requires of us, to train up our children to use them. The morning is

the most favorable season for exercising the frame, as well as for making useful impressions in the mind and heart of important facts, moral principles, or religious feelings, and whoever tries to conduct the education of his child independently of this practice, will lose some of the most favorable opportunities.

☞Several new works are received and on our table, not yet read; amongst them are a new work by *James Fishback*, D. D. of Lexington, Ky. containing essays on various subjects—one from *John M. Duncan*, of Baltimore, on Creeds. Their time for being read will soon arrive, and notices of them will probably appear in the next volume.

PROPOSALS,

By *A. S. HAYDEN*, for publishing by subscription, AN INTRODUCTION TO SACRED MUSIC; comprising the necessary rudiments, with a suitable collection of tunes, original and selected, and a few set pieces and anthems.

The design of this publication is to collect a number of tunes not found in any other work which he has seen, and to insert some original tunes, together with some others of most common use. Circumstances and times within the author's acquaintance render such a work, in his opinion, necessary.

Conditions.—The work will contain about one hundred pages, octavo, printed on good paper, and neatly bound. Price, 50 Cents.

[Our confidence in brother A. S. Hayden, as an adept in the science of sacred music, authorizes us to call the attention of the public to his proposals. The contemplated publication will have one excellence which we highly appreciate—the verses which will be set to the tunes will not be the high praises of the Lord, but good moral sentimental poetry. This will prevent much profanity in taking the name of the Lord in vain: for we cannot regard in any other light *learning to sing by the use of the most sacred words*, when the praise of God is not in the hearts of the pupils, but in the science of music.

The disciples in Ohio are so well acquainted with the good taste and musical attainments of brother Hayden, that his name is enough to secure their patronage to this undertaking.]—*Ed. Mill. Harb.*

New Arrangements respecting our Publications.

THE many orders for books, unfilled—the late and irregular appearance of our numbers in the month—the many letters unanswered—and, in some instances, the failure on our part to have the workmanship always executed equal to the materials purchased and the price paid for it, much to our mortification—and a number of other drawbacks on our proceedings, have advised a new order of things—a new economy.

At much expense we have got up a good establishment—presses, types, book bindery, and all the apparatus thereunto belonging—Printers and Book-Binders, of high standing in their profession—the best materials, selected from the eastern market—every thing at par with similar establishments: yet the whole concern is comparatively unprofitably managed. The community is not served nor benefited in any adequate degree with the labor and expense incurred, nor in the ratio of the means and facilities possessed.

What is the cause? The editor, publisher, supervisor, and manager of the whole concern is more than the half of every year from home. Of the other half a large proportion is spent in religious conversation with numerous friends and brethren who honor him with their visits. Meanwhile, things are left to manage themselves in the best way they can. The best has been done that could be done under these circumstances. As far as business attentions and good intentions, and vigorous efforts are concerned, we cannot reform.

But we can put the concern into the hands and under the management of those who can serve the community better than we could possibly do. This we have determined to do; and accordingly have transferred the book department into the hands of brethren JAMES T. M'VAY and ALBERT G. EWING, reserving to ourselves only the management of our monthly periodical and the literary department, from and after the first day of January next.

This will afford us more time for travelling, for laboring in the word and teaching, and for attention to the editorship of our periodical. We would gladly give this up also, if we could conscientiously retire from these labors; but in the meantime we cannot.

It is stipulated with these brethren that the new version shall be put at the same price with the common version—paper, workmanship, &c. being equal—as soon as *the yet undefrayed* extra expences incurred in stereotyping the work shall have been refunded. The new version, with the extra prefatory matter and appendices, is nearly one third larger than the common version; and in the proportion of size it can be sold at the same price, done up in the same style. This work we consider the most valuable service we have rendered this generation, and we wish to see it diligently read and compared with the common version by every disciple. It is designed to be a *pocket-companion;* and we religiously think there is not a better one on earth.

A new edition of the Hymn Book is now in the hands of bookbinders, and will be ready for delivery in a few days. The orders for the work will be filled as they are bound.

In view of the contemplated change in this establishment, we request our patrons and agents, in addition to the many favors received, that their accounts would be settled up to the close of the present year, as soon as possible. From all the information we have learned from other establishments, we are of opinion that, for promptitude in payment and fidelity to the interests of this Office, our patrons and agents are not surpassed by the supporters of any press in the union. There are, however, considerable arrears due us, which are all necessary to the closing of the business of the year, and to meeting the new crisis in our affairs anticipated, on the first of January next.

I presume it is only necessary for our friends to know this: for their promptitude on all occasions warrants us to look forward with a confidence to which few Editors have attained. Meanwhile, they will please accept our thanks for past favors, and our best wishes for their individual health and happiness.

EDITOR.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Number XI.——Volume V.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Bethany, Va. December, 1834.

The Millennium---No. 4.

The Coming of the Lord.

THE literalists contend that the phrase, "*coming of the Lord*," always means a personal appearance of the Lord, and nothing else. Their system of interpretation makes this necessary: for if this phrase be ever used like all other phrases figuratively, then their system totters. We shall, therefore, be at some pains to examine the acceptation of this phrase.

Prior to this, though subservient to it, there is a classification of the Apostles and Prophets with respect to the dates of their respective writings, indispensable to an accurate interpretation or application of their predictions. Every interpreter of prophecy works in the dark, who has not all the Prophets, Old Testament and New, arranged with special reference to two great epochs in sacred history. These are *the captivity of Judah* and *the final destruction of Jerusalem.* In classifying the Old Testament Prophets relative to the former event, we make three distinct classes:—

1. Those who wrote antecedent to the Jewish Captivity.
2. Those who wrote in whole or in part during that Captivity.
3. Those who wrote after the Captivity.

The arrangement must be made with accuracy before any person can either interpret, or apply, with confidence, their predictions.

The New Testament prophecies must be arranged in two classes: those uttered and written before the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, and those written after. Numerous and great errors have been published to the world on the prophecies, through inattention to this classification. Not only with reference to the question now before us,

but in reference to all that we may say on the subject of prophecy, we shall, according to the best documentary proof of the most learned biblical chronologists, proceed to the classification of the Jewish and Christian Prophets with respect to these two great epochs in sacred history.

Jewish Prophets of the 1st Class.

Those who finished their testimony before the Babylonian Captivity of Judah, are—

		Before Christ.	*Before the Captivity.*
Jonah,	who prophesied	862	256
Amos,	do. do.	787	181
Hosea,	do. do.	785	179
Joel,	do. do.	789	179
Isaiah,	do. do.	760	154
Micah,	do. do.	750	144
Nahum,	do. do.	113	107
Zephaniah,	do. do.	630	24

Jewish Prophets of the 2d Class.

Jeremiah wrote from 629 to 588, twenty-three years before the Captivity and nineteen under it.

Habbakuk—about the time of the Captivity.

Daniel, 603 — from the 3d to the 69th year under the Captivity.

Ezekiel, 595 — from the 11th to the 32d year of the Captivity.

Obadiah, 587 —

Zephaniah, 587 — prophesied under the Captivity 19 years.

Jewish Prophets of the 3d Class.

Haggai, 520 — commenced 16 years after the Return!

Zachariah, 520 — after the Return 16 years.

Malachi, 397 — after the Return 139 years.

Concerning Zechariah, it is agreed that from the 9th chapter to the end was written nineteen years before the Captivity closed; and the 8 first chapters of Zechariah are 67 years later than the last. But sixteen of the Old Testament Prophets have transmitted to posterity their own predictions under their own names. The Jews enumerated forty-eight Prophets and seven Prophetesses. We, however, can reckon only forty-nine in all. These lived nearly in the following order of time:—

Adam, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Aaron, Miriam, Joshua, Deborah, Hannah, Samuel, David, Gad, Nathan, Solomon, Jeddo, Shemaiah, Ahijah, Hanani, Jehu son of Hanani, Azaria, Elijah, Elisha, Micaiah, Hosea, Amos, Jonah, Eliezer the son of Dodavah, Jahaziel, Isaiah, Micah, Obed, Nahum, Joel, Jeremiah, Zephaniah, Huldah, Igdaliah, Habbakuk, Ezekiel, Obadiah, Daniel, Haggai, Urijah, Zechariah, Malachi.

Of these, eight wrote before the Captivity of Judah; three after the Return; and during the Captivity, six; one of whom also wrote after the Return. So that all the sixteen Jewish Prophets, whose works are still extant, flourished in a period of Jewish history less than four centuries.

All these facts are of much value in understanding many of their allusions, and especially their style, as the sequel may disclose.

The New Testament Prophets all wrote before the destruction of Jerusalem, except John the Apostle, who wrote after it, as all antiquity avoucheth. In the reign of Domitian he was banished to the island of Patmos, about the year 95, at which time he had the vision recorded in the Apocalypse.

That there is some danger in being too literal in the interpretation of prophecy, may be learned from the prophecies written before and during the Captivity. But to give an instance that cannot be explained away, I will select an example from one who wrote after the Return, at least 139 years. He speaks of a great and notable day of the Lord; consequently, it was then future, and is not to be sought in the calamities that befel Judah or Israel in their captivities. But he speaks of *the coming of Elijah* before that day. Now suppose the Jews in the time of Messiah had expected this day of the Lord was at hand; and amongst them had been a layman, a great literalist, like my friend M'Corkle, who, in sounding the alarm, exclaimed that the day of the Lord was to be preceded by the literal return of Elijah—how great would have been the error! Had he waited for the literal and personal return of Elijah, and argued that the coming of Elijah literally meant the coming of Elijah, would not the day of the Lord have overtaken him unawares! Elijah never came, yet the prophecy was truly fulfilled; so, though Jesus return not personally before the Millennium, still it may be truly said that the Lord will destroy the man of sin by the brightness of his coming. I say, it is possible, and probable too, that the Lord may come in some other sense than by a literal personal return.

The particular import of such phrases as "the day of the Lord," "the last days," "the coming of the Lord," "the great and terrible day of the Lord," can only be ascertained satisfactorily by attending to the time in which the Prophet wrote. For there have been a plurality of last days, of days of the Lord, of great and notable and terrible days of the Lord, of comings of the Lord. Through inattention to this, Messrs. Begg, M'Corkle, and other literalists have regarded these phrases as of one and the same import wherever they have found them. If I mistake not, Mr. Begg somewhere asserts that the words *coming of the Lord* always mean a literal coming or personal appearance of the Lord. We are at issue here.

But not to lose sight of the subject before us, and that we may all see that much depends upon a strict regard to the era of each Prophet, we shall exemplify this matter by a reference to sundry remarkable days of the Lord.

Isaiah xiii. 6. "Howl ye, for *the day of the Lord* is at hand: it shall come as a destruction from the Almighty." ver. 9. "Behold *the day of the Lord* cometh, cruel both with wrath and fierce anger, to lay the land desolate; and he shall destroy the sinners thereof out of it. For the stars of heaven and the constellations thereof shall not give their light: the sun shall be darkened in his going forth, and the moon

shall not cause her light to shine. And I will punish the world for their evil, and the wicked for their iniquity; and I will cause the arrogance of the proud to cease, and will lay low the haughtiness of the terrible. I will make a man more precious than fine gold—even a man, than the golden wedge of Ophir. Therefore, I will shake the heavens, and the earth shall remove out of her place, in the wrath of the Lord of hosts, and in the day of his fierce anger." The question now is, *What day of the Lord* is this? Is it past or future? We affirm that it is *past*. The Prophet wrote 760 years before Christ, or 154 years before the captivity of Judah. But this day of the Lord was *at hand* when he wrote this prophecy. It is dated about 130 years before the Captivity. Again, it is the message of the Lord concerning *Babylon!!* The prophecy begins with these words, "The burden of Babylon, which Isaiah the son of Amos did see." The Medes are spoken of, ver. 17. as the instruments of God's vengeance; and towards the close of the vision, (ver. 19.) it is written, "And Babylon, the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldeas' excellency, shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah." It is, then, certain that *this day of the Lord*, with all its sublime and awful scenery—the obscuration of the sun, moon, and stars—the shaking of the heavens, the removal of the earth, and the destruction of sinners out of it—refers to the coming of the Lord to destroy the Assyrian Empire. If, now, all this awfully sublime imagery, characteristic of this terrible day of the Lord, was apposite to the events of that day, how diffident ought we to be in asserting that the same imagery descriptive of other days of the Lord, fierce and terrible, must be understood literally, or that *the day of the Lord* import the literal coming of the Lord to usher in the Millennium! The *day of the Lord* came upon Sodom and Gomorrah—upon Babylon—upon Judea—and will come upon Babylon the Great, the mystical Babylon of the Apocalypse. Ancient Babylon fell by the sword, but not in one day. Cyrus slaughtered many of its inhabitants. Darius Hystaspis afterwards still more fully depopulated it. Xerxes destroyed its temples, including that of Belus. A Parthian King afterwards carried multitudes of its inhabitants into captivity. The building of Seleucia on the Tigris exhausted the last remains of its inhabitants, and for thousands of years it has lain in perfect ruins. Its site is scarcely known. In the words of Milton,

> ——————————And in their palaces,
> Where luxury late reign'd, sea monsters whelp'd
> And stabled."

Such was *the day of the Lord* on Babylon. The prophecy was uttered about 200 years before the event.

Joel ii. 1. we have the day of the Lord upon Judea. "Blow you the trumpet in Zion, and sound an alarm in my holy mountain! Let all the inhabitants of the land tremble; for *the day of the Lord* cometh; for it is *nigh at hand*." This day of the Lord is described at great length, a part of which only we have room to quote: "A day of darkness and of gloominess, a day of clouds, and of thick darkness, as the

morning spread upon the mountains; a great people and a strong: there hath not been ever the like, neither shall be any more after it, even to the years of many generations." vers. 9, 10. "The earth shall quake before them, the heavens shall tremble, the sun and the moon shall be dark, and the stars shall withdraw their shining. And the Lord shall utter his voice before his army; for his camp is very great: he is strong that executeth his word; for *the day of the Lord* is great and terrible, and who can abide it?" This description of the day of the Lord, *threatened* to Judea in all the poetic imagery of the Prophet, can be understood only of the ravages of the clouds of locusts and caterpillars, which, to use the words of the poet, "left the land behind them a desolate wilderness, which, before then, was as the Garden of Eden.'

In the same chapter we have another *day of the Lord*, referring to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, verses 28—32. This is quoted and applied by Peter in part, in his Pentecostian address. The imagery is the same with *the day of the Lord* upon Babylon. But in Zechariah xiv. 1. we have the destruction of the city still more graphically exhibited: "Behold *the day of the Lord* cometh, and thy spoil shall be divided in the midst of thee. For I will gather all nations against Jerusalem to battle; and the city shall be taken, and the houses rifled, and the women ravished; and half of the city shall go into captivity, and the residue of the people shall not be cut off from the city." Those nations which composed the Roman army are then spoken of as the objects of divine vengeance; for as the Lord destroyed them that destroyed Babylon, so did he destroy them that destroyed Jerusalem. But in the 4th verse the Prophet resumes the description of the destruction. As Cyrus was God's instrument, and as the Lord did upon Babylon what Cyrus did; so Titus is his instrument against Jerusalem, and the Lord stands where Titus stood. For upon the Mount of Olives, the spot on which our Lord stood when he foretold its fall by the Romans, stood Titus; there he posted his army to batter down Jerusalem. Here the tenth legion that came to him from Jericho was placed, as Josephus declares, in the wars of the Jews. lib. 6. c. 3. Mount Olivet by the lines of circumvallation, the redoubts and trenches made by the besieging army was cleft in twain. But here I find myself unceremoniously making my intrenchments on debateable ground, and shall leave this strong post of my friends Begg and M'Corkle till a more convenient season. We are at present examining those great epochs called *the day of the Lord*, and have already found *that "the day of the Lord," in the mouth of a Prophet, means some future day of vengeance and judgment upon the people to whom he addresses himself, and that all these days are described in the same imagery, clothed in the sublime of terrible grandeur and majesty.* Poets cannot be found more similar in their descriptions of Spring or Autumn, than are these Prophets who describe those moments of divine indignation against nations once the objects of God's peculiar favor.

As much depends on establishing this matter firmly in the mind of

the student of prophecy, I shall be at double pains to prove the proposition before me. We shall, then, briefly notice a few similar passages.

The *day of the Lord* upon Egypt, or upon Pharaoh's army. Jer. xlvi. 10. "*For this is the day of the Lord of hosts*—a day of vengeance, that he may avenge him of his adversaries; and the sword shall devour, and it shall be satiate and made drunk with their blood: for the Lord God of hosts hath a sacrifice in the north country by the river Euphrates. O virgin! the daughter of Egypt! in vain shalt thou use many medicines; for thou shalt not be cured."

Ezekiel the Prophet (chap. xxx 3.) thus describes *the day of the Lord* on Egypt: "For the day is near, even the day of the Lord is near—a cloudy day: it shall be the time of the heathen, and the sword shall come upon Egypt, &c. —— 20. The day of the Lord is represented always as a dark and cloudy day, as in Zechariah xiv. 6.—"In that day the light shall not be clear nor dark; it shall be one day known to the Lord—not day nor night." Hear Amos: "Woe unto you that desire the day of the Lord! To what end is it for you? The day of the Lord is darkness, and not light." v. 20. "Shall not the day of the Lord be darkness, and not light? Even very dark, and no brightness in it?

Malachi speaks of the day of the Lord coming upon the Jews in the most appalling terms: "Behold the day cometh that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts; and it shall leave them neither root nor branch."—"Behold I will send you Elijah the Prophet before the coming of the great and terrible day of the Lord." It may here be pertinently observed, that the *day of the Lord* on apostate christendom will be still more terrible than the day of the Lord upon Sodom and Gomorrah—than the day of the Lord upon Egypt—upon Assyria, upon Babylon, upon Judea, or upon Jerusalem—because more elevated and distinguished than any of them. Need we observe that the day of the Lord mentioned by Malachi, is ascertained to be the day of his vengeance upon the second Temple and Jerusalem by the Romans, inasmuch as he wrote after the former *day of the Lord* upon Judea, spoken of by the Prophets before the Captivity!

In the Epistles the phrases "the coming of the Lord," and "the day of the Lord," are used in the same latitude. In the following passages the phrase "day of the Lord" denotes "*the judgment of the* GREAT DAY," which certainly is a day subsequent to the Millennium itself. Reference is found to this day, 1 Cor. v. 5. "Deliver such a one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." 2 Cor. i. 14. "We are your rejoicing, even as you also shall be ours in the day of the Lord Jesus" But, says Peter, 2d Ep. chap. iii. 10. "the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night, in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also, and the works that are in it shall be burned up." My good lay

brother became *spiritual* when he found this description of *the day of the Lord* clashing with his theory of a literal personal return before the Millennium. He ridicules the doctrine of "world-burning" as too literal, because it literally burned up his system. But of this in its proper place.

That the destruction of Jerusalem is spoken of in the Epistles, both as "the day of the Lord," and "the coming of the Lord," will, I think, appear as evident as that there are diverse days of the Lord in the Old Testament Prophets. In the first letter to the Thessalonians, chapter ii. verses 15 and 16, Paul, speaking to the Jew, says, "Who both killed the Lord Jesus and their own Prophets, and have persecuted us, and they please not God, and are contrary to all men; forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved, *to fill up* their sins always; for the wrath [or vengeance] is coming upon them at last" [or to the uttermost.] In reference to "the times and seasons" of this wrath, Paul, before the close of the letter, says, "You have no need that I write to you; for you know perfectly that *the day of the Lord* so cometh as a thief in the night; for when *they shall say*, Peace and safety! then sudden destruction cometh upon *them*, as travail upon a woman with child, and *they shall not escape*." That this was a day nigh at hand the Apostle clearly intimates—a day which the Thessalonians were expecting to see: for he says that day of the Lord which cometh upon *them* as a thief in the night, *shall not come upon you unawares*." That the words "coming of the Lord" are also used figuratively in both Testaments, can be as fully and as clearly demonstrated, as that the phrase "day of the Lord" is applicable to various judgments of God inflicted upon diverse nations, kindreds, and people in different ages of the world.

There is one literal *day of the Lord*, and there is one literal *coming of the Lord* still future. But our object now shall be to show that there is a *figurative coming* of the Lord as well as a literal coming. And to proceed: The first time that we find the word *come* in relation to God, in the way of promise, is Exodus xxi. 24. "In all places where I record my name *I will come* unto thee, and I will bless thee." Was this a literal or a figurative coming of the Lord? But I may be asked, 'What do you mean by a figurative coming?' To which I answer, Any display of God's gracious or vindictive presence—any interposition or vivid display of God's favor or of his wrath is, in all propriety of speech, thus expressed.

In the book of Genesis itself we are taught the beauty and propriety of this style. "God came to Abimelech in a dream by night." Gen. xx. 3. "The Lord came down to see the city and tower." Gen. xi. 5. "God came to Laban the Syrian in a dream by night." Gen. xxxi. 24. So the phrase became current in the time of Moses: "God came to Balaam at night, and said." Num. xxii. 9.

This is the language of the Bible. It is not peculiar to any writer. David, as well as Moses and all the Prophets speak thus. David, addressing the Lord, says, "O when wilt thou come to me! I will walk in my house with a perfect heart." In the same style Jesus said,

"Where two or three are assembled in my name, I am in the midst of them:" "I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in and sup with him and he with me:" "We will come and make our abode with him."

In the same style the Apostles speak of the coming of the Lord, when his power is to be displayed upon his enemies. Thus the *day of the Lord* upon Jerusalem is described by both Paul and James. Paul says to the believing Hebrews in regard of their suffering persecution from their countrymen, "You have need of patience;" but it is only for a short period: "for," continues he, "yet a little while, and he that shall come [or is to come] will come, and will not tarry." Heb. x. 36, 37. James also says, "Be patient therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord." As the husbandman is patient; "Be you also patient. stablish your hearts, for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh." James v. 7. Thus the ancient Prophets spoke of God's vindictive displays upon his enemies. "Say to them that are of a perfect heart, Be strong, fear not: behold your God will come with vengeance, even God with a recompence; he will come and save you." Is. xxxv. 4. "For behold the Lord will come with fire and with his chariots, like a whirlwind, to render his anger with fury, and his rebuke with flames of fire." Is. lxvi. 15. "Our God shall come, and shall not keep silence; a fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him." Psalm. l. 3.

Having now, we think, fully shown that the phrase "coming of the Lord" does not necessarily mean a *personal* appearance; but that it certainly, in various passages, means no more than some special interposition or display of his power in the way of judgment or of mercy—may we not ask, on what ground do the literalists, who argue for the personal return of the Messiah to usher in the Millennium, or to avenge the man of sin, rest their arguments? Have we not satisfactorily shown that this main pillar of their edifice stands upon the sand? And may we not, with all Scripture evidence and authority, assert that, as the Lord came to route the builders of Babel—to destroy Egypt—to break to pieces the Assyrian—to destroy Babylon—to avenge Jerusalem—so will he *destroy the man of sin by the brightness of his coming?*

But the literalists rely much upon the phrase "*coming in a cloud*," or "*in the clouds of heaven;*" and as they deserve to be heard on this subject also, we must promise them a candid hearing and an impartial examination. A REFORMED CLERGYMAN.

Letter to William Jones.

MR. WILLIAM JONES,

My much esteemed and venerable brother!

MAY favor, mercy, and peace be multiplied to you through the knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ our Lord! I acknowledge, with many thanks, the reception of your very acceptable favor of the

3d September, on the 15th instant. I esteem it one of the most valuable communications I have received for a long time. "As cold water to a thirsty soul, so is good news from a far country."

It affords me pleasure to correspond with the wise and good on the affairs of the common salvation, and especially with one in the land of my fathers, who is not only well instructed in the kingdom of heaven as it is developed in the authentic records of the Apostles, but as it has existed from the beginning, and exists in our own time, and amongst our own people. I, therefore, gladly take my pen to reciprocate the favor which I have received from you, as far as my ability and circumstances will permit. To begin with your interrogatories in the order in which you have propounded them. You say —

"Let me beg the favor of you to explain to me the following passage in your letter to Mr. Wyeth: 'The ancient order of things, without the ancient gospel, will not succeed. What God has united ought not to be separated. The world would not be converted in 10,000 years by the system of operations got up by our good Father M'Clean and his coadjutors.' Now, sir, am I to understand you as intimating that the Scotch Baptist churches separate the ancient gospel from the ancient order? If so, in what respects does this appear? And again, in what do you consider the system of operations defective among us? We would most gladly be informed, that we might alter it. Please be explicit on this head."———

I regret exceedingly that the box of books, which I forwarded to New York for you, early in the summer, has not reached you. I sent you a copy of almost every thing I had written. Had you received the seven volumes of the *Christian Baptist* and the four volumes of the *Millennial Harbinger* enclosed in that box, you would have had ample information of our views upon this point. I trust you may have received them ere this reaches you. But lest you have not, I will, as fully as I can, in the size of a common letter, offer a few suggestions on this subject.

The religion of our exalted Redeemer is as perfect a whole, and in all its parts, as the universe which he has builded. In it there is nothing deficient—nothing superfluous. It is adapted to man as it finds him; and it must be presented to man as he is, and not as he is not. It comes to us in the form of a record, or testimony; which testimony, believed, brings it into the heart. The testimony treats of facts and their meaning. The order of things in the divine economy is, therefore, facts, testimony, faith, a change of views and feelings, called *repentance*, issuing in reformation, immersion, the enjoyment of remission of sins, adoption into the family of God, and the light and consolation of God's good Spirit. Or to place the leading terms in the proper order, from Alpha to Omega, they stand—facts, testimony, faith, repentance, immersion, remission of sins, holiness, the hope of a glorious resurrection to eternal life, and good works. The facts are the works of God and man; the testimony of God respects the meaning and tendency of these works, divine and human; faith receives the whole as true, because the testimony is confirmed by the

power of God: this works in the heart repentance: and this works obedience; first, in immersion; then comes the enjoyment of a personal and plenary remission of all past sins, in the name, or by the authority of the Lord; and then communion with God by his good Spirit received, holiness of heart and life, the blessed hope, and character corresponding to it.

Now I would not be understood that the preaching of such a theoretic view, or of any theory of the gospel, is preaching the gospel. One of the fatal mistakes in christendom is the preaching of some theory of the gospel, rather than the gospel itself. To preach the gospel, is to declare the testimony of God, his precepts and promises. It is to declare what we have done and what he has done—[*facts*]—to *prove* it by the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven—by the Prophets and Apostles—[testimony.] To convince men that it is true—[faith;]—to persuade them to change their views, feeling, and behaviour—[repentance or reformation;]—to put off the old man and to put on Christ—[immersion;]—to regard themselves then as Christ's, (pardoned, justified, sanctified, regenerated to God;) and to walk in Christ as children of God, (led by the Spirit;) and to adorn their profession—(living soberly, righteously, and godly in the present world.) All this is done by fairly, fully, honestly declaring the whole testimony of God. This is to preach the old gospel; and this is to preach it as did the old Apostles, who were neither Calvinists, Arminians, Trinitarians, Unitarians, or any thing else but the followers of Christ.

The technicalities of Calvinism, Arminianism, and the fanaticism of New Lightism of some sort, have divested the gospel of its ancient simplicity and power. The word of God, which is living and effectual, has been converted into "*a dead letter;*" and the *ignis fatuus* of some physical or abstract agency on the hearts of unbelievers, working faith in them, is now represented as the power of God to salvation. Thus the word of God is made of non-effect; and in this country dreams, visions, and new revelations of the Spirit are substituted for the truth formerly delivered to us by the saints.

Even the English Baptists in America have got up Methodistic camp meetings, anxious seats, mourning benches, clerical intercessions, and all the paraphernalia of passion-stirring operations; shouting, as if God were asleep; swooning, fainting, and metaphysical convulsions, as if God were to be compelled by the vehemence of preachers and hearers to have some sort of new mercy upon them.

The Scotch Baptists, on the other hand, appear to me to be so straitened by the cords and stays of hypercalvinism, that they are afraid to command all men to repent and obey the gospel, lest they should savor of Arminian works, and make void the grace of God. They are so fettered and manacled, and paralyzed by Calvinian metaphysics, that they are unable to utter the strivings of the Holy Spirit, the arguments, remonstrances, and persuasions of Prophets and Apostles. The preachers appear all concern that their hearers should *think* right, as if men were to be saved by thinking correctly. If at any time they quote such sayings as "God so loved the world

that he sent his only begotten Son, that whosoever believes on him might not perish, but have everlasting life," they are compelled by their theory to neutralize it all by foisting in the word *elect* before the term *world*, or by such qualifications, explanations, and theories of conversion, effectual calling, &c. &c. as make the gospel a mere instrument in the hand of the Spirit for saving the elect.

We who preach the original gospel are compelled to avoid all such speculations. We have no wish or inclination to prove Calvinism or Arminianism to be true. We only say that neither of them is the gospel which Peter preached. We speak the word of God in the terms and phrases of the book, and address men as Jesus and his Apostles did, not mingling our own philosophy, nor that of Luther, Calvin, Wesley, with the teachings of the Holy Spirit.

There is something in the matter and manner of our preaching very different from any thing which we heard in Britain or Ireland. It is true we read the same Bible, preach the same faith, declare the same facts, exhibit the same testimony concerning them; but we begin at the day of Pentecost, and speak from that book as if we had lived before Augustine, or Tertullian, or Origen, or Justin Martyr, or before the Protestant reformers were born.

We do not preach to every man as Paul preached to the Philippian Jailor. When a person, as ignorant as the Jailor, asks what he should do, we say to him what Paul said to the Jailor; but we take care to follow Paul to the end of that chapter, and speak to him the word of the Lord, as well as say, "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ." If a believer asks what he should do, we say to him, *Repent* and be baptized, as Peter addressed the Pentecostians after they believed that Jesus was the Messiah. If a believing penitent, like Saul of Tarsus, in Damascus, asks what he should do, we neither say to him *believe* nor *repent;* but, "Arise! (why do you delay?) and be immersed, and wash away your sins, calling upon the name of the Lord." Thus we divide the word of truth, and address every man as we find him.

The effects of this preaching differ from the effects of Calvinian and Arminian preaching as much as these systems differ from the Apostles. In a few years many myriads under this preaching have been converted to God; and these converts have an assurance of remission, and a confidence that they are the children of God, founded on the testimony—on the promise of God, and not on fancy or imagination, as is too common under all the philosophic systems of the age. How long, think you, my venerable brother, would twelve missionaries be in converting the world by reading or preaching Calvin's Institutes or Arminius' *Five Points!* If they lived the life of Methuselah each, and labored with the zeal and assiduty of Paul, would they in such a lifetime convert Asia, Africa, or Europe to the Lord?

A great deal, you well know, depends upon a proper arrangement, the position of things, to any result. While the gospel was veiled in the Jewish institution, the changing of the figure of the tabernacle or of the *position* of the furniture in it, or of any of the vestments of the High Priest, would have changed, obscured, and corrupted that reli-

gion. In the outer court, next the entrance, stood the brazen altar; next to it, and near the door of the tabernacle, stood the laver, filled with water. On entering the holy place, on the south or left side, stood the golden candlestick; on the north, or right side, stood the table covered with the twelve loaves of the presence; and before the vail stood the golden altar. Thus was the gospel pictured out in the pattern showed to Moses in the Mount. Now to have changed the position of any one of these—to have placed the laver first, or the golden altar where stood the brazen, would have corrupted or obscured the meaning of the whole Mosaic institution.

But as it was possible for the Levites to place all these things in their proper place, without understanding the meaning of them, apart and altogether; so it is possible to have a scriptural order of things without understanding the scriptural ideas represented in all the parts of the Christian institution.

The Baptists in England and America have placed the brazen altar and the laver in the outer court, according to the divine model; but they have new-modelled the furniture and changed its location in the holy place; indeed, they have put the table with the loaves of the presence, for the most part, in the corner, or dispensed with it for the greater part of the year. Instead of placing the loaves upon it every first day of the week, they have made *new weeks*, of *a month each*, or *a full quarter of a year*, and sometimes even *then* the stale bread is not removed. The Scotch Baptists, on the other hand, have arranged the furniture of the sanctuary in proper order; but seem not to have laid a due emphasis upon the furniture of the outer court, or its position in it. I have understood that *James Haldane* in Edinburgh, and *Alexander Carson* of Tubermore, Ireland, persons held by me in high esteem, have virtually dispensed with the laver, or allowed those without to enter the holy place by approaching the altar alone. Do you rank these brethren among the Scotch Baptists?

The apostolic gospel led men first to the altar, then to the laver; first to the sacrifice of God's own Son, and then to the laver of regeneration. Their converts had their hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and their bodies washed with clean water before they approached the golden altar. They confessed their sins and acknowledged the efficacy of the blood of the cross before they were immersed, and they were immersed *in* the name of the Lord, *into* the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, FOR the remission of sins, before they entered the sanctuary. They buried their corruptions in the grave, arose to a new life, became priests to God under the great High Priest of the Christian confession. Then they drew near to the vail, in the full assurance of remission; they approached the golden altar by the light of the golden candlesticks, strengthened by the bread of life; for in God's sanctuary there is light, and there is life, and there is joy. Their praises and songs of thanksgiving arose to heaven like the incense of the morning.

The christian worshippers, thus once cleansed, had no more conscience of past sins. But if any one, through temptation, transgressed

the order of the house, or sinned against its Master, he needed not to return to the laver; but to confess his sins and forsake them in the assurance of pardon; for the blood of Jesus Christ cleanses us from all sin.

You have in these outlines our views of the gospel and gospel worship; which are never to be separated, if we would either convert the world or enjoy the Christian salvation.

The whole system of sermonizing, text preaching, expounding scriptural scraps, and of doctrinal expositions, is unauthorized by God, and is not the way to save sinners or edify saints. There is no trace of such a mode of procedure in the apostolic age, nor in the times immediately subsequent thereunto. This system has darkened the counsel of God, and filled the world with error. It is unreasonable and it is unscriptural. I would not be understood that a single sentiment or some one topic of the Christian faith, piety, or morality, may not with propriety be a proper subject of an address; but in that case the subject is approached through a whole epistle, or section of an epistle, or portion of the sacred history; and is set before the audience in the light of its own context. There are much fewer parallel passages in holy writ than annotators and marginal references would seem to indicate. It is very difficult to find two words in the English language, or any other, exactly synonymous; and to me it appears just as difficult to find two portions of scripture exactly equivalent.

But I am rather writing an essay for general use, than addressing a father, a much esteemed and venerable father in Israel. My habits of writing so much in the didactic style, will, I trust, be accepted as an apology for any thing I have written bearing this aspect. I have only touched at one point in your letter, and at that but imperfectly; but as you requested me to be explicit, I have occupied so much of my letter on this point, that I shall have to defer answering your other questions till the next month. I intend, God willing, to write you once every month, till I have answered all your questions; and will solicit in return from you such information as will enlighten me more fully on the state of things in England and Scotland. I will endeavor to communicate to you any information in my possession relative to the state of religion in this country, in all the denominations with whose statistics I am acquainted, or on any subject that may be interesting to my brethren in the British empire. Any matters of a more private nature I will add in the way of *postscripts;* and you will please do the same, that the parts of our correspondence interesting to the citizens of Christ's kingdom in general may be laid before them, as I lay this letter before my readers.

But I am aware that I have not fully satisfied you on the question before me; and that you may see wherein I regard our friend M'Lean's system of operations defective, I shall state *our manner* of preaching the word; leaving you, on comparison, to decide how far on this single point we and they differ. Our evangelists, that is, they who proclaim the word for the purpose of converting men to the Lord, after proving

that Jesus is the Messiah, and laying before the audience his person, office, and character, and exhorting the persons addressed to put themselves under his guidance; tender an invitation to all present, who have not yet put on Christ, according to the promises, to come forward and signify their determination to submit to his government. Thus we make a draft on the faith of the audience, and give to all present an opportunity of deciding how much confidence they have in the person, office, and character of Jesus of Nazareth. After testifying and exhorting, if any persons come forward and thus acknowledge Jesus, confessing him to be both Lord and Christ, and avowing their intentions to become citizens of his kingdom, we, on confession of the faith, immediately, or as soon as practicable, (by night or day,) take them to the water and immerse them by the authority, or "in the name of the Lord Jesus," *into* the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, "*for* the remission of sins"—that they may *enjoy* all the blessings of his government who is exalted a Prince and a Saviour to grant reformation and remission of sins to Jew and Gentile, turning away from their iniquities. This is the *application* of our discourses. In this way we soon know, and the people know who believe and repent, and who do not. We then baptize with the same despatch as the first preachers—"that same day," or "that same hour of the night," as the case may be. Thousands have been thus brought into the kingdom. who now rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory.

In the highest esteem and christian affection, I have the honor to be your fellow-servant in the kingdom of heaven, and brother in the Lord, A. CAMPBELL.

Bethany, *Va.* November 17, 1834.

New Plan of Church Union.

THERE fell into my hand, on the 8th November, a "sermon "on the subject of the union of Christians for the conversion of the world; delivered in Madison, Ohio, April 20, 1834, by the Rev. *Andrew Wylie*, President of Indiana College. Brother *Emmons* kindly forwarded to me a copy of said discourse, which I have read with varied emotions both of pleasure and of pain. Upon the whole, the pleasing emotions preponderated over those of a contrary character. As a literary production, this discourse, like those of *Doctor Wylie* generally, is of a respectable character; for he is of respectable standing in the commonwealth of letters.

The Doctor, in the set phrase of high church orthodoxy, is yearly becoming more and more *heretical*. He is almost as heretical now as I was some twenty years ago. May I not add, I would to God that he were not only almost, but altogether as heretical as I am, except the *odium theologicum* which I have still to endure.

The doctrine of this discourse, or the main part of it will be found in my remarks written about two weeks since, on the "*Horrors of Heathenism*"—a doctrine which we fully preached in the first numbers of

the *Christian Baptist.* The following extract from this discourse, if compared with the first number of the Christian Baptist, will exhibit a remarkable coincidence.—p. 5, 6, 7.

"We must not expect that great and good Being, whom we revere as the author of nature and grace, to work *contradictions* in our favor, either in nature or grace—to give to darkness and death the properties of light and life, or to communicate the tendencies of hatred and discord to love and union, or *vice versa.* Much less may we indulge those feelings which produce discord, or rather constitute it, under the delusive expectation that God, because he is almighty, will convert the world at any rate. He has told us, both in his written word and in the experience of fifteen centuries, that the union of Christians is a moral means necessary to the conversion of the world. How dare we, then, look for the end without the means? How dare we expect that efforts for the conversion of the world, originating in principles the very opposite to that holy principle which he has ordained and consecrated as the instrument for the conversion of the world, should be owned and blessed of him for that purpose? Do we expect him to contradict himself!—to falsify his word!—to set aside the prayer of the Redeemer!—to incorporate the works of the devil among the effective agencies of the kingdom of heaven!

Am I to be referred, in contradiction to all this, to the alleged fact of the rapid diffusion of christianity in our day, which, it will be said, has taken place, notwithstanding the discord which, it must be granted, still continues to distract and disunite the great body of professing christians? This, I am aware, is touching upon a delicate point. Glowing descriptions are continually presented of the success of missions. And, to call their truth in question, would seem like speaking against Christianity itself; and by many, be set down to the account of lukewarmness to its interests—or to something worse, if any thing worse can be. But let us not suffer our wishes to mislead our judgments. It is grateful to the feelings to hear of Zion's prosperity, and to recount the growing numbers of her converts. And we are often found anticipating the employments of Eternity; and, without waiting till he who "writeth up the people" shall exhibit the record of immortality, to look around us and say, "This man and that man was born there." But still, when we come to take an impartial view of the actual state of the world, we meet with facts which may well moderate our notes of triumph.*

* "Prophecy"—and "The Signs of the Times"—are favorite themes of reference on occasions when people are to be stirred up to increasing benevolent effort. The object is good: but the means are, at least sometimes, questionable. When statements of an opposite character follow each other in close succession:—for instance, when, at one time, we are called upon to hail the opening dawn of the millennial day, and, the next moment, terrified with the prospect of the Catholics taking possession of the land, and depriving us of our civil and religious liberties—the effect is bad. Should the christian religion, as to its influence in the world, be destined to undergo an eclipse—should "*the vintage*" of the Apocalypse be yet future, what use might not the sceptics and the scoffers of that time make of the premature predictions of

What has become of Christianity in Asia Minor, Greece, Germany, Italy, Switzerland, Spain, France, Holland, and the north of Africa? Has religion kept pace with the growth and diffusion of our own population? Are the Aborigines of our borders evangelized? Are the two millions and a half of our colored population——Alas! alas! notwithstanding all that is told us of the progress of Christianity —and I am not now going to call in question the truth of the accounts which are given us on this subject—though, in all the cases which have happened to fall under my own personal notice, the statement generally has gone a little beyond the fact—yet, granting the truth of all we hear and read on the subject of the extension of Christianity in our day, the undisguised, the humiliating truth is, that less has been done towards the conversion of the world in the present generation by united christendom,—I mean by divided, distracted christendom,—than was effected by Paul the Apostle of the Gentiles, in his own single, persecuted person. I do not say that less has been done *about* this business, by the aggregate efforts of christendom, than was done by Paul. For I admit there is a good deal of zeal among christians in relation to this subject—though far from enough—and many societies are organized—and speeches made, and dollars raised, and printing presses employed in furnishing copies of the Bible, and tracts, and books for children, to be gratuitously taught on the Lord's day—in short, there is a vast machinery set up and kept in motion, with a direct tendency to, and bearing upon, the desired object. All this is well: and more of this sort of work, I allow, is done by us than was done by Paul. But still, I aver, less is *effected*. We hear a vast multitude employed with pickaxes, and levers, and blasts of powder, in trying to heave from its base the "stone" which is to smite the image and break it in pieces, and then "become a great mountain and fill the whole earth;" and shouting multitudes send up a perpetual cry of encouragement,—but still it does not move—it does not grow. With this state of things compare the progress of christianity in primitive times. The "leaven hid in three measures of meal"—how soon did it ferment the general mass!—how soon did christianity diffuse itself through the greatest part of three continents! The "grain of mustard seed"—how rapid, how noble was its growth! Do we witness any thing similar in modern times? What permanent effects, among the Indians of our neighborhood, have, for instance, followed from the labors of Elliott, and Brainerd, and Mayhew, and Edwards, and many more of the like spirit who succeeded them in this field of labor?

---

the present day? Let christians be warned, by one of of the least among them—by one, however, whose habit it has been, for many years, to study the Bible, not as a theological controversialist, but to find direction in "the good and right way"—to beware of attempting to live by sight and not by faith, and of placing their confidence on numbers—on means—on pecuniary resources—on arts of worldly policy. Let them remember, that, in all past ages of the church, there has ever been the most of real religion where there has been the least vaunting. And let ministers of the gospel remember, that it is "He that goeth forth and weepeth, bearing precious seed," that "shall doubtless come again with rejoicing, bringing his sheaves."

None! Comparatively none! How is this? With solemn emphasis let each christian hearer propose to himself the question, How is this? "The arm of the Lord is not shortened that it cannot save, nor his ear heavy that it cannot hear.—Our iniquities have separated between us and our God: our sins have hid his face from us." And what among the number of our sins is more prominent, more scandalous, and more likely to have produced this effect than the sin of DISCORD among brethren? The spirit of discord has driven the spirit of christian meekness from the church, by whose influence alone it is that the world is to be converted."

This doctrine was the head and front of my offending against the piety of my then good neighbor *Wylie* and his party in Western Pennsylvania. The school of adversity is a good school and teaches to profit. The family broils of the Presbyterian church have already taught many of its sons a lesson which I could not teach them in the days of their prosperity. Some of them, however, will not learn even in that school; but my friend Wylie is not of that obtuse class. He has learned much; but still he has much to learn before he breaks his way out of the shell of the Geneva Theology. The light of day, however, having broken upon his vision, I trust the sweet influences of it will cause him to energize mightily until he find an easy egress from the confines of the Calvinian egg. A little more external heat and a few more vigorous efforts, and he will clap his well fledged wings and soar aloft to a purer and more serene sky.

The capital mistake in the last half of this sermon, is, that he recommends means most unphilosophic, or wholly inadequate to the end proposed, viz.—*the union of the church.* What would a more liberal construction of the words of the Westminster Creed do to unite christians—(*not the church!* What a fallacy! The Protestant church! What is it? Where is it?) If they would construe more liberally than the freest translation of Horace or Juvenal, it would not mend the matter a farthing. The most liberal and advantageous construction of them would be to construe them all away, and substitute the Bible alone. Mr. Wylie's scheme of union would not unite the Presbyterian church alone. Besides, it is a fallacy to imagine, or insinuate, that the Confession of Faith is not rightly construed by his own brother *William Wylie* and all his confederates. They believe it means what it says; and how will *Andrew Wylie* construe it to make it mean what it does not say?

The following *oath*, it would seem to me, precludes the whole scheme of Mr. Wylie's constructions. All the professors who teach the ministers of the Presbyterian church, would be guilty of *perjury*, if, while they continue in that church, they construe one word of that book, intentionally to change the proper, logical, and grammatical meaning of one period found in it.

Will Mr. Wylie reconsider the following oath administered to all the Theological professors of his *church?*—

"In the presence of God and the Directors of this Seminary, I do solemnly, and *ex animo*, adopt, receive, and subscribe the Confession of Faith and Cate-

chisms of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, as the confession of my faith, or as a summary and just exhibition of that system of doctrine and religious belief which is contained in Holy Scripture, and therein revealed by God to man for his salvation: and I do solemnly, *ex animo*, profess to receive the form of government of said church, as agreeable to the inspired oracles. And I do solemnly promise and engage not to inculcate, teach, or insinuate any thing which shall appear to me to contradict or contravene, either directly or impliedly, any thing taught in the said Confession of Faith, or Catechisms; nor to oppose any of the fundamental principles of Presbyterian church government, while I shall continue a Professor in this Seminary."

Now may we not ask, How is the Professor to construe the Confession of Faith more liberally, bound by the awful sanction of a triple oath, not even *impliedly* to contradict or contravene any thing taught in the said Confession of Faith! As is the master, so the scholar. These pupils must, on pain of perjury on the part of their teacher, never hear from him any thing, in the judgment of the teacher, contrary to the true intent and meaning of that Confession. And what is to become of the common people? They are to be taught by men who were taught by teachers solemnly sworn never to let them hear an argument which, in their judgment, directly or impliedly contradicted or contravened any doctrine, dogma, or sentiment in the Confession of Faith! And yet Mr. Wylie recommends a more liberal construction of the Confession of Faith as a means of uniting the church—(*Presbyterian*, I presume:) for he has too much sense to imagine that the Westminster Confession, though sustained by as many oaths as there are articles in it, would ever be the basis of the union of any church, except the Presbyterian.

But if it were worth while to pursue this matter farther, I would prove by arguments not to be set aside, that *liberal constructions* of the Creed are the very roots and causes of disunion. Seven times, at least, in 150 years, have Presbyterians attempted to construe the Creed more liberally, and every attempt at liberal construction caused a new schism in the body!

Our plea has been, and still is, Burn all the Creeds in Cristendom—abandon all their technical phrases—forget, as soon as possible, all that was ever learned from them—take the Book that God endited, the Creed which he inspired; and read, study, and practise it in the spirit of Christ, in meekness, humility, and love; and then all christians must necessarily come together, because the walls and curtains of division would then be burned up. The more creeds the more parties. Let us have no *human* creed, in its ecclesiastic sense, and then we can have no sect, not so much as one Presbyterian from Nova Zembla to the Cape of Good Hope—from the head of the Ganges to the mouth of the Origon.

Mr. Wylie recommends more courtesy, charity, &c. &c. along with this liberal construction of the creed; but as these are but matters of course, we cannot view them as means to the end proposed. I would recommend to the President the perusal of Mr. *John M. Duncan's* last treatise on Creeds. I have glanced over a part of it only; and I shall have to form a new opinion of the intellect of Mr. Wylie, if he

will carefully read that short treatise, and say that he is not convinced that all the creeds, oaths, and fines ever invented or printed will unite the church, keep error out of doors, or prevent the multiplication of sects.

The progress of light and of public opinion is now such that these creeds must inevitably go into disrepute. They must give place to the Bible, as the shadows nursed by night retire from the brows of the mountains when the sun bursts forth from the gorgeous chambers of the East, and rejoicing begins to run his glorious race.

EDITOR.

Conversation in Father Goodal's Family Circle, at 'Squire Baxter's.

[*Continued from page* 560.]

AFTER the usual compellations and salutations of the company assembled at 'Squire Baxter's, and the singing of a few choice pieces of christian psalmody, *Father Goodal*, seated in a large elbow chair, in which (tradition said) the Prince of Orange once sat, interrogated 'Squire Baxter concerning the news from Bristol.

'Squire Baxter.—There is nothing that caused greater distress in Bristol, for some time past, than the untimely death of three young gentlemen, all the sons of clergymen. True, indeed, their profligate and abandoned lives for some years past prepared their friends and acquaintances to expect such an unhappy issue.

Mr. Reed.—What were the circumstances of their exit?

'Squire Baxter.—One shot himself; one was killed in a duel; and one was drowned in seeking to escape an officer of justice; and all this in three successive days!

Mr. Reed.—Lamentable indeed! Had they been confederates?

'Squire Baxter.—Yes; confederates in all the vices of the age!

Mr. Reed.—The sons of clergymen!

'Squire Baxter.—Yes; one the son of a Rector, and the other two sons of dissenting ministers.

Father Goodal.—And what the religious standing of their fathers?

'Squire Baxter.—So and so: neighbor-like for orthodoxy and all the forms of religion: one of them, indeed, is no way distinguished for a very scrupulous morality. The other two were, however, at a fair medium value as respects the general estimate of clerical virtue: you know the clergy in England, as a class of men, are nothing above par either for religion or morality, with any other class in the community.

Father Goodal.—Not only in England, but in Scotland and in Ireland too: they will gain nothing on comparison with the same number of farmers, mechanics, merchants, &c.

Mrs. Fowler.—But how comes it to pass that their children will not bear comparison with the children of their own parishes, or with the children of any other cast in society?

Mr. Reed.—That is a problem, indeed, sister Fowler. The fact is, however, undeniable; and I have agonized often when I have thought of it.

Mrs. Reed.—My husband is very sensitive upon this subject; and he has lectured his children more on this account than, perhaps, from any other circumstance.

Mr. Payne.—Perhaps this is the way to bring about such an issue. I have, while in England, frequently thought that the greater restraints and the severer discipline exercised over the sons of clergymen, than over the sons of their parishioners, was the proximate cause, or a very leading cause of their greater profligacy. As waters dammed up for a time burst forth with greater fury, so these youth, sallying forth from a more grievous discipline than that under which other youths are placed, rush headlong into follies greater and more mischievous than the follies of other young men.

Mr. Reed.—I have reasoned much in the same way; but the question here arises, If such be the tendency of good discipline, why are we taught by Moses, Solomon, and Christ to discipline our children well, and to restrain them from evil?

Mrs. Fowler.—I have thought that good men by some sort of necessity must have wicked sons.

Mr. Cunningham.—That is my doctrine, Mrs. Fowler. I have generally seen the blacksmith's horse badly shod, the cordwainer's children barefoot, the tailor's son with his elbows out of his coat, and the Parson's son the wildest youth in the neighborhood. And the philosophy of the whole matter is, that as the children of Israel loathed the manna, so we loathe and disparage those things which are always about us—common as air and water. Only read your Bible, Mrs. Fowler, and you will see that it is owing to necessity. Noah was the father of Ham; Abraham was the father of Ishmael; Isaac was the father of Esau; Jacob had at least ten out of twelve sons wicked; Moses left no son of any good fame behind him; Aaron's sons, Nadab and Abihu, were consumed by fire from heaven because of their iniquities; the good Eli's sons, Hophni and Phineas, were cut off in one day for their impiety and presumption; Samuel, the renowned and excellent Samuel, had two sons, Joel and Abiah, Judges in Israel, but turned aside after lucre—took bribes, and perverted judgment.

And what shall I more say of the sons of Jesse—of David and Solomon, and of the good kings of Judah and Israel? How many sons of Belial were found among the Prophets, Priests, Judges, and Kings of Israel?

Mrs. Fowler.—You go too far for me, Mr. Cunningham. I only meant to say, that by some sort of necessity attending the common mode of education, there must be many profligates amongst the sons of the clergy.

Mr. Payne.—And might I not retort upon my friend Mr. Cunningham, and ask him who was the father of Shem, of Isaac, of Jacob, of Joseph, of Moses and Aaron, of Samuel, of David, of Solomon, of almost all the renowned Kings, Prophets, and holy men of antiquity?

If good men have had bad sons, they have also generally had some of the best sons the world ever saw.

Mrs. Fowler.—But we are Christians, and we have had a better document put into our hands to train up our children by, than Jews or Patriarchs possessed; and we have no warrant from the New Testament, nor examples, as far as I can see, to authorize us to expect such results, if we bring up our children in the knowledge and discipline of the Lord.

Mr. Cunningham.—But if we had as much New Testament history as we have Jewish history, I think we would find that the sons of Apostles, Prophets, and teachers were no better than the sons of other people. Recollect, if you please, the New Testament history is so short that we have no means of knowing how the sons of Peter and the other Apostles got along. One thing is certain, that none of their sons obtained as much reputation as Timothy, or Titus, or Epaphras, or Silas, or a hundred others mentioned before the year 64.

Mrs. Fowler.—This is all conjecture, Mr. Cunningham.

Mr. Cunningham.—Conjecture it may be: but very probable conjecture it is; for before John the Apostle finished his apostolic labors there was a great backsliding and falling off some way or other.

Mrs. Fowler.—Against your conjectures I have got the whole New Testament history, as far as it goes. John the Baptist was the son of Zachariah and Elizabeth, two of the most excellent persons in Jerusalem; Jesus was born of the pious Mary, betrothed to the virtuous and excellent Joseph; Cleophas, who married the sister of Mary, was another excellent man, and three of his sons were Apostles of Jesus Christ! Zebedee, too, was a very good man, and two of his sons were amongst the Twelve. Simon Peter, his wife, and Andrew his brother, seem to have descended from a righteous stock. Peter's wife's mother was one of those who ministered to Jesus. Indeed, all the connexions of those disciples that appear conspicuous on the New Testament page, seem to have been imbued with a religious education, and to have descended from the best families of Galilee and Judea. John Mark, Timothy, and others whose lineage is noted, appear to have been the descendants of a pious ancestry. There is as much wisdom evinced in giving no conspicuity to the sons of Apostles, Prophets, and Evangelists in the sacred history, as in any of the incidents of ordinary history recorded in these sacred books. Had we, for instance, read that Peter's eldest son was bishop of the church in Corinth, and his second son bishop of the church in Ephesus—his third son deacon of the church in Rome, and his fourth son an evangelist in Athens—had we read of many honors and dignities bestowed upon the sons of these distinguished officers in the Christian kingdom, we would involuntarily have been led to think that the kingdom of the Messiah, like the kingdoms of this world, respected blood and family, and a sort of ecclesiastic nobility. If any of this family pre-eminence had appeared in the New Testament, it would have been in vain to oppose the Romish and English hierarchies, and the whole system of church patronage. But as it is, there is not a single squinting in

favor of the religious nobility of ancient and modern hierarchies; and yet there is just as much said on the subject of the relatives of the great and good in the New Testament, as to show, that, if preference and pre-eminence are not to be given to families on account of their religious progenitors, they are to lose nothing on that account, but to be like all other citizens of the kingdom—eligible according to their capacity and character.

Mr. Cunningham.—Well, Mrs. Fowler, you have, in getting round my system, also unbraced your own: for how now will you dispose of your necessity!!

Mrs. Fowler.—I will tell you, Mr. Cunningham. Children follow example much more than precept, and they are much more discriminating than their parents imagine. I once spent a few weeks in a Minister's family in the county of Antrim, who was just as excellent a man, and of as high reputation for intelligence, piety, and morality, as any preacher in the north of this island: he was, moreover, excessively strict in the discipline of his family—made them read the Scriptures on "the Sabbath," and commit the Catechism every Saturday evening; he attended upon worship night and morning, without intermission, from year to year; used the *ferula* very freely, and restrained his children very much; but yet neither his good lady nor himself exemplified that they were sincere in all this. Their religion appeared to be forced upon them by circumstances, and not natural, and they were trying to force it upon their children just as it had been forced upon them. Their children could discriminate, and did discriminate; and looked upon the whole affair as a sort of tax which was to be paid, and you know taxes are always paid with reluctance. The truth is, interest bound the forms upon the parents; but passion tore them off the children. I am therefore of opinion that so long as Ministers and their wives have to assume a sanctified appearance for the sake of emolument and honor, and only seek to impose the same restraints upon their children which they impose upon themselves, it will necessarily issue as it now generally does.

Father Goodal.—Add to all this, that neither religion nor right reason sanction those unmeaning restraints and penances which persons artificially religious have to impose upon their children. I have always thought that the gaiety, cheerfulness, and vivacity of youth should be cherished, only moderated and restrained by the wisdom of age: rural exercise, amusement, and innocent recreations with select company, are not to be forbidden youth. Indeed, parents ought rather to take part with their children in such amusements and recreations than to frown upon them. Could parents combine instruction and amusement, and business and pleasure, nature and religion, then children would be

"Warn'd by the wisdom of age,"

And parents would be

"Cheer'd by the sallies of youth."

EDITOR.

Address of Churches in Illinois.

A PREVIOUSLY appointed meeting of Bishops, Deacons, and brethren, was held in Springfield, October 17th till 20th. The design of this meeting was to consider the best means of spreading and promoting the cause of Christianity. After prayer a committee was appointed of brethren *Bledsoe*, *Hewitt*, *Osborne*, *Gray*, and *Elder*, to draft an address to the congregations of Christ in the state. They having presented one to the meeting, it was unanimously adopted. The letter presented is as follows:—

"To the Churches or Congregations of Jesus Christ, in the state of Illinois—Greeting:

Dear Brethren,

In accordance with previous notice, a considerable number of brethren, many of whom are teachers of Christianity in the upper part of this state, attended the meeting at Springfield, October 23d, and continued together several days. From their knowledge of the situations of the congregations—from a consideration of the necessity of public teaching to rend asunder the veil which has so long dwelt upon the hearts and minds of the world—from their conviction of the great advantage of united effort in promoting any object, they unanimously agreed that it was advisable to send out one or more brethren to act as evangelists, and to engage in a course of public teaching among all the congregations of Christ.

In order to effect this object, however, it is necessary to secure the co-operation of the churches. To this end, every congregation in Illinois is earnestly requested to attend to the following particulars:—

1st. That each church determine in itself what it will contribute for the support of one or more evangelists annually.

2d. That they report to brother *J. T. Jones*, of Jacksonville, the location of the congregations, the number of members in each church, the names of their teaching brethren, and of their deacons, and the amount which each congregation is willing to contribute to the support of evangelists.

It will be readily apprehended that these things are necessary to be done, in order that evangelists may be sent out, and that every congregation may be benefited. No doubt is entertained that this will be promptly attended to.

We do not desire to conclude without saying, that there is a periodical about to be established in Jacksonville, devoted to the cause of *Bible religion*. Of its Editor, *B. W. Stone*, we need say nothing. He has been too long in the fore front of the reformation, battling the enemies of the King, to require us to say one word in relation to him. In regard to the proposed periodical permit us to remind you of the mighty influence of the press for good or ill; let us remind you how many minds are enlightened by its agency, upon whom, otherwise, no ray of knowledge would ever fall. Let us direct your attention to the mighty efforts which the enemies of the reformation are making by it,

and having done this, let us ask you, as members of the congregations and as individuals, to do your utmost to support it.

In conclusion, brethren, we would say a few words as to the necessity of co-operation and united effort. The foes of the cause for which we plead are banded together, and wealth and learning are made subservient to their views. To oppose them we have the word of God and the power of Truth. Let us ever remember that very much depends on us. In olden time there was a temple built with hands, rearing its proud front on Mount Zion, dedicated to the Lord of hosts, and shadowing forth his glory. Its splendors are dimmed—its courts are forsaken—its glories buried—its guardian angels departed! Now the church of Christ is the temple of the living God, built of living stones, dwelling in the light of heaven, to show to the world the perfection and truth of God. Like a city set on a hill, it cannot be hid. It is for us to determine by our conduct whether the battlements of that city shall rise in beauty, and continue in strength, or whether her towers shall be thrown down, her palaces deserted, her walls desolation, and her gates dust.

Dear brethren, we commend you to God and the word of his grace."

This letter having been approved by the meeting, brother *John Rigdon*, at the unanimous request of the brethren, consented to act as an evangelist for the next six months.

Brother *J. T. Jones*, of Jacksonville, was appointed Corresponding Secretary. Brethren *Adams* and *Gray*, of Springfield, were appointed Treasurers.

It was agreed to hold a general co-operation meeting at Jacksonville, to commence on Friday before the last Lord's day in May next, to which the brethren throughout the state are invited.

It was agreed by the brethren to recommend to the churches the patronage of the *Christian Messenger*, to be edited by *B. W. Stone*, after December next in Jacksonville. Let as many subscribers be procured as possible, and their names communicated to him by the 25th of December. We advise the brethren to be prompt to this business.

M. O. BLEDSOE, *Chairman.*

Abstract Spirit.

JAMESTOWN, *Ohio*, November 5, 1834.

Dear brother Campbell,

YOUR recent essays on the Holy Spirit have been full of edification; but many have not understood you. The idea is out in the world, and in this reformation too, that after the gospel is believed and obeyed, God sends his Spirit into the understandings of men and women, and thereby enables them to understand the written word, and to apprehend God as their Father. The idea is, that the Spirit is somehow received into the heart or understanding, apart from the gospel; or if not entirely apart from it, that it is not by, or through it;

but that God, by some *direct* communication, which he has not revealed, sends his Spirit into the hearts of those who obey his word, and that, by the *Spirit thus received*, bearing witness with their spirits, they are enabled to prove themselves to be the children of God. Those who attempt to prove their relation to God in this way, do it by *assertion—yes, by bare assertion;* and the strongest assertors in this way are those who have not obeyed the written word of God, who profess to have propitiated God to forgive their sins without obedience to his word. Now, brother Campbell you see that this kind of proof may be given by all manner of enthusiasm and hypocrisy. If, then, this be the witness appointed of God to designate his children, I know not how any assertor can be detected as an imposture. For if the testimony of the Spirit in the written word is not sufficient to prove legitimacy, how can it be proved by it that any pretender is illegitimate?

The idea is also out, that this abstract reception of the Spirit may be known by a kind of *indescribable feeling*, somewhat similar to that imparted by a swift passage through the air, as in a swing. If this be not superstition, I know of no appropriate name for it.

All this may have grown out of a misunderstanding of the written word. I do verily believe that many noble minds, even among us, have, to the present day, viewed promises made to the people in the apostolic age of the world, as extending to this; and more especially, *the promise of the Holy Spirit.*

I am willing to acknowledge that I have mistaken the history as given by Luke, if any thing like *feeling or impulse* by the Holy Spirit was ever hinted at by him. The Holy Spirit spoken of and alluded to by him, was a witness to unbelievers as well as to believers; so that when any were said to be sealed by the Holy Spirit, *the seal could be seen* with the divine impress of *miracles* upon it. When any are said to have received an unction, they are also said to be taught by it, (and not by the written word;) therefore, the *unction* there spoken of must have been the same miraculous gift or gifts of the Holy Spirit spoken of by Joel and John the Baptist, and promised to the disciples of the Lord, and said to be fulfilling on the day of Pentecost by Peter, and by him mentioned as extending to all flesh (Jews and Gentiles:) "*The promise* is to you and to your children, and to the (Jews) afar off, and to as many (of the Gentiles) as the Lord our God shall call." But all this did not extend *the promise* beyond its original limit—"THE LAST DAYS."

Yours as ever, M. WINANS.

John Wesley, a Reformer.

HILLSBOROUGH, *Illinois*, October 27, 1834.

Elder A. Campbell,

I HAD just sealed a letter to send to you, and put it into the office, when I commenced reading Mr. Wesley's Works, *new*

edition. In reading "A Treatise on Baptism" by Mr. Wesley, I was struck with the sameness of his and your views of the benefits received by baptism; and I was led to wonder why his followers object to the doctrine for which you contend, when it so well agrees with the doctrine of Mr. Wesley. In order to show what the views of Mr. Wesley were on the subject above referred to, I will make an extract from his works, vol. 6, page 15:—"By baptism we are admitted into the church, and consequently made members of Christ its head. The Jews were admitted into the church by circumcision; so are the Christians by baptism. 'For as many as are baptized into Christ,' in his name, 'have' thereby 'put on Christ.' Gal. iii. 27.—that is, are mystically united to Christ, and made one with him. For 'by one spirit we are all baptized into one body.' 1 Cor. xii. 13.—namely, the church, 'the body of Christ.' Eph. iv. 12. From which spiritual, vital union with him, proceeds the influence of his grace on those that are baptized; as from our union with the church, a share in all its privileges, and in all the promises Christ has made to it.

"By baptism we who were 'by nature children of wrath,' are made the children of God. And this regeneration which our church in so many places ascribes to baptism, is more than barely being admitted into the church, though commonly connected therewith; 'being grafted into the body of Christ's church, we are made the children of God by adoption and grace.' This is grounded on the plain words of our Lord, 'Except a man be born again of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' John iii. 5. By water, then, as a means, the water of baptism, we are regenerated or born again; it is also called by the Apostle, 'the washing of regeneration.' Our church, therefore, ascribes no greater virtue to baptism than Christ himself has done. Nor does she ascribe it to the outward washing, but to the inward grace, which, added thereto, makes it a sacrament. Herein a principle of grace is infused which will not be taken away, unless we quench the Holy Spirit of God by long continued wickedness.

"In consequence of our being made children of God, we are heirs of the kingdom of heaven. 'If children,' as the Apostle observes, 'then heirs—heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ.' Herein we receive a title to, and an earnest of, 'a kingdom which cannot be moved.' Baptism doth now save us, if we live answerable thereto; if we repent, believe, and obey the gospel: supposing this, as it admits us into the church here, so into glory hereafter.

"In the ordinary way, there is no other means of entering into the church or into heaven."

[Many more extracts of a similar kind might be made, but the above may suffice for the present.] RICHARD O. WARINNER.

New Discovery.

A LUTHERAN Minister, of the "far West," has discovered by reading the 10th chapter and 14th verse of Mark,—("For of such is

the kingdom of heaven,"—indubitable evidence that infants were members of the ancient apostolic church. This text, he says, evidently means the church militant, and proves it from various passages of Scripture where the kingdom of heaven is mentioned. He further says, "No one doubted the right of infants to church membership previous to the beginning of the 18th century, and that the universal custom was, to receive infants as members of the visible church." This I consider a noble discovery, and will be of great advantage to be generally known. It will, perhaps, have some tendency to settle this long controverted point!

Such like harangues as the one we heard to-day, is the kind generally delivered in this country. I hope the time is not far distant when the *ancient gospel* will be preached in its purity throughout this rich and happy land.———Yours as ever,

RICHARD O. WARINNER.

From the Western Monthly Magazine.

OBITUARY.

DIED, on the 12th October, at the house of Mr. Anderson, in Madison county, after a short illness of cholera, Mr. THOMAS S. GRIMKE, of Charleston, South Carolina, aged forty-eight years and a few days; a gentleman who, to the greatest modesty of character, and sweetness of disposition, added uncommon intellectual attainments, qualities which gave him a great and just influence in his native state; which made him known and admired abroad; and which rendered him the delight of the domestic circle in which he lived. Mr. *Grimke* was a member of the bar at Charleston, standing in the front rank of the profession; the man of learning, and of industry; the wise man and the eloquent. His sentiments were those of an accomplished christian, who founded his whole scheme of thought and conduct upon the solid basis of christian duty, tested every principle by the precepts of the Bible, and avowed himself on every occasion a disciple of Jesus Christ. He was a theorist and a reformer, who advocated a system consistent in itself; but which, while it won the suffrage of every christian and patriot, and conciliated for its advocate the profound respect of his hearers, was carried out in its details to an extreme point, to which, to say the least, the minds of this generation are not prepared to follow. In education, he would have banished alike the restraints of coercion and the incitements of emulation, requiring every act of the young mind to flow from a principle of duty, and he would have dispensed with the ancient languages, and the higher mathematics: in religion, his principles, on fundamental points, were those of the great body of enlightened christians; but in a variety of details he would have gone back to the customs of the primitive church. Although an Episcopalian, he maintained the entire parity, not merely of the clergy, but of the whole christian body, and believed that every professed follower of the Redeemer, whether lay or ecclesiastic, was equally bound to preach the gospel, and alike authorized to administer the ordinances of the church.

Progress of Reform.

Extracts from Letters.

HOME, *near Paris, Tenn.* October 13, 1834.

THE reformation is progressing slowly in this part of the Western Country. At our union, or camp-meeting, at Crooked Creek, Carroll county, *three* only were immersed; but I think much seed was sown. Brother Peyton W. Smith was with us there on Lord's day and preached. I expect that he will settle himself in this county, and a valuable accession will it be to us. At Roane's creek, Carroll county, *two* were immersed, and I think much seed sown. Our young [23 years of age] but amiable, beloved, pious, zealous. *powerful* and *able* brother Allen Kendricks, was principal laborer here as also at Crooked Creek. Never did I hear the false principles of sectarianism so well exposed, and the sufficiency and power of the Sword of the Spirit to circumcise the heart, to slay its enmity to God, and make us "wise unto salvation," so ably exhibited, and the plan of salvation so clearly developed. I could not attend at the meeting in Calliwa, Ky. the county adjoining us on the north, in consequence of bad weather and ill health. I have been informed that *seven* were immersed there. I am anxious to see *all* our congregations, every where, "walking in *all* the *commandments* and *ordinances* of the Lord blamelessly," meeting together *every* first day of the week, as did the ancient disciples, coming behind them in no good work. Until this is the case, the reformation will not be complete, and cannot prosper much. Let our proclaimers preach *less* upon the *theory* and *more* upon the *practice* of religion; let them enforce, with all their power and zeal, the importance, the necessity of keeping the commandments and obeying the precepts of the gospel, and I think it will change the aspect of this lamentable state of things which too generally prevails. Our Lord is the "author of *eternal* salvation unto all them that *obey* him;" and "the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, with his mighty angels, in *flaming fire*, taking *vengeance* on them that know not God, and that *obey not the gospel* of our Lord Jesus Christ." Here is a warning that should sound like thunder in the ears of those who are not living in obedience—speaking to them in trumpet-tongued tones, "Fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man!"

In the hope of a glorious immortality, your brother in Christ,

JOHN R. HOWARD.

MONROE COUNTY, *Mo.* October 19, 1834.

SINCE my last communication to you, I have immersed fourteen persons, and was present in Marion county, where brother E. Ballinger immersed eight. He has since then immersed four more.

THOMAS THOMPSON.

WHITBY, *U. C.* October 21, 1834.

SINCE I wrote you last, I have had the happiness of knowing that there are a little band of reformers in the city of Toronto, about twenty in number. They have no particular teacher; but meet together every first day and attend to the ordinances of God's house.

MARSHALL B. STONE.

CAROLINE, *Va.* October 22, 1834.

IF I had time I would say something about the state of things as they exist among us; but time presses. I will make one remark on the slow progress of the reformation *party* among us—I say *party*, for the principles are rapidly extending. If I have observed aright, the extension of the principles of the reformation among the different denominations, is one principal cause of the slow progress of the party established exclusively on those principles. The vener-

ation for the old societies, being now aided by the active principles of the reformation, gives these societies a double advantage over us. And the same doctrine coming from a *Reformer* and an *Old Baptist* will meet with an entirely different reception. Hence their success and our failure. But even their triumph shows their weakness—for they conquer with our weapons. In conclusion, I state it as my firm conviction that nothing but the prejudice of *name* prevents the union of *Reformers* and *Old Baptists*. From these prejudices may the Lord deliver his people!

Yours in the fellowship of the gospel,

THOMAS W. TOLER.

TUSCUMBIA, *Alabama*, October 24, 1834.

SOME time in June last a few names in this place, together with myself, were judged unworthy of longer fellowship, and accordingly have been cut off from all connexion with the Baptist church, and subsequently with the Association. This pharisaical act, though not unprecedented in our days, was quite an unceremonious one—having been accomplished without entering into a a formal trial, or preferring a single charge, save a suspicion that we were *C——ites*, resting upon a desire on our part to take the Christian Scriptures, as an all sufficient rule of faith and practice. Since our exclusion and separation from the Baptist denomination, twelve of us organized ourselves into a worshipping congregation, to be called 'the Church of Christ at Tuscumbia;" since which time the Lord has graciously added to our numbers, until we have now about thirty members, living in great harmony, peace, and love, and meeting every first day of the week to worship him who is Lord of the Sabbath, to commemorate his death for our sins, and to rejoice in the hope of life through his resurrection. We have much opposition to encounter—long cherished opinions, deep-rooted prejudices, and jealous fears are all arrayed against us; but though our opposers are numerous, they are without strength; and though they have zeal, it is without knowledge: therefore, we will not despair; for greater is *he that is for us*, than they that are against us.

Yours in the hope of heaven,

W. H. WHARTON.

JACKSONVILLE, *Ill.* October 25, 1834.

Dear brother Campbell,

I HASTEN to give you an account of a protracted meeting, held by the disciples of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in Springfield, on the 3d Lord's day (Friday and Saturday previous) of this month.

As the saints were scattered and dispersed over a large territory, and but little known to each other, it was thought advisable to appoint a meeting, in order that an acquaintance might be formed—that a history of the churches might be known—and that they might co-operate in the great work of sending out as many evangelists as possible.

The teaching brethren present were B. W. Stone, John Rigdon, Alexander Reynolds, Josephus Hewett, H. W. Osborne, Abner Peeler, Matthew Elder, Edward Baker, and others.

The information afforded was, generally, that the congregations had but few teachers—that few were employed in itinerating. The brethren were unanimously in favor of securing the co-operation of the churches, to the end that evangelists should be sent out. John Rigdon accordingly was appointed to act for six months, to which he consented. At the conclusion of that time, it is contemplated to have a general co-operation meeting to arouse into activity the churches on this subject.

Nine persons were immersed at Springfield during the meeting. Solemnity usually pervaded every countenance. Better times were hastening on. The opposition to the reformation has greatly ceased, and more time, I fondly anticipate, will be taken in the examination of the saints' duties and privileges. The brethren in Jacksonville, are not increasing in number—a coldness among

them is too apparent. The return of the Lord's day is not celebrated by more than one half. O may they reform and exhibit a light to the traveller bewildered in the dark, who roams in sin and folly!

The congregations generally, I may say, are doing too little. The charms of an imposing world bind those who should live with God, down to its false maxims. Too much conformity to the world is seen among the children of God.

W. D. HENDERSON.

CARLOWSVILLE, *Ala.* October 26, 1834.

THE past Lord's day was among the most felicitous of my life! After exhibiting *the* word for three successive days amid anxious minds, my soul was elated at the reception of three aged and respectable persons into the kingdom of Messiah's reign; one of whom was from the territory of John Wesley; the other two from the vicinity of John Calvin, in a little *borough* denominated Predestinarian Baptistville! In the afternoon of Lord's day the Saviour's death and resurrection were set forth.

Our sectarians in this part of Alabama think that the views for which we plead will soon burn down! Elijah had a struggle with dogmatical priests; but when their gods forsook *them*, Elijah's was forthcoming. Strong analogy. 2 Kings, chap. xviii. There is another parallel case, Gen. x. 10. About a hundred and twenty years after the deluge, *certain* ones undertook a heavenly pilgrimage by their own inventions. By a confusion of tongues they were sadly disappointed! Our modern Babel-builders are more confused than the former, and therefore their works cannot go on. O for the restoration of the pure speech! even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, in Zion!

If the advocates of the restoration of the ancient gospel will but cultivate—(not the temper and spirit of brother Chambers, of pamphlet memory—but) of the High Priest of their profession, even Jesus, the conquest is sure.

J. A. BUTLER.

MONROE, *Ten.* October 28, 1834.

THE reformation is progressing here through opposition from the Baptists and Methodists. I was opposed in public last Lord's day week by a man who has been a preacher in the Methodist denomination, for using the word *immerse* instead of *baptize*; but in spite of all that can be said, we are increasing. I immersed near the Three Forks of Wolf river, in Tentress county, 7 persons in two months; and since the 15th of August last I have planted a church in Tentress county, at the mouth of Lick Creek. Thirteen of its members I had immersed—two joined by letter.

WILLIS HUDDLESTON.

ASHTABULA, *Ohio*, October, 1834.

MY success has been so small in spreading the gospel at the East, that, perhaps I should not have written to you on that subject, were it not on account of the matters stated above. I will, therefore, just mention that owing to the solicitation of friends and brethren, and my own ardent desire to enlighten the people, I spent the summer in that region, met with much opposition, chiefly behind my back; but notwithstanding all, had some success. Though only fourteen were immersed, there were at least one hundred and twenty converted to the ancient faith, within the bounds of my labors, principally from among the Baptists. Besides there is a still greater number who acknowledge and advocate the truth, but stand without the kingdom, as I think, to the influence of the leaders of the people who will not enter themselves, nor suffer those who would. The intelligent part of community are getting tired of human dogmas, and readily listen to the ancient gospel. Could some able proclaimer be sent among them, the prospect is, there would be a great ingathering.

Yours in the gospel,

NATHAN PORTER.

CAPTERN, Belmont county, *Ohio*, November 8, 1834.

I WILL give you a short account of the progress of reform in our neighborhood. There have been about twenty-persons recently immersed into the name, &c. for the remission of sins. Brother Hosman immersed three last Sunday evening. Three weeks since my brother James immersed six. Our number at the Lord's table, for four or five years past, was about twenty—we now number forty-two, the most of whom meet every Lord's day to commemorate the death and sufferings our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. The prospect among us is good. Travelling brethren are invited to visit us. In brother Stonebraker's settlement, a few miles below us, there have been about twenty-eight immersed for the remission of sins.

JOEL MILLISON.

WATTSBOROUGH, *Va.* November 10, 1834.

REFORMATION has prospered beyond our most sanguine expectation for the last eight months. Hundreds have come in, and the prospect is still good. Though the opposition is great, he hope we shall conquer through the word of the Lord, if we persevere.

GILL W. WATTS.

The Church at Connellsville.

Connellsville, November 10, 1834.

MR. A. CAMPBELL,

Sir—SOME things which transpired during your late visit to this place, and connected with the division among the Baptists here, have left the minds of many in doubt, and which it is thought you can remove.

You said that there should be unity of faith, but that difference of opinions should not cause divisions among disciples—leaving us to suppose that difference of faith should cause divisions. But there seems to be a difficulty in determining what is matter of faith, and what matter of opinion. If, as some understand you, nothing but fact—something done—be matter of faith—then is all we live in expectation of—all that is promised—matter of opinion only? or if the whole record be matter of faith, what then is left for opinion? The oneness mentioned in John xvii. seems to allude to more than faith, "that they may be one *as we are one*"—"I in them and they in me, that their union may be *perfected*." [New Ver.] The memorial presented to the church calls the same thing difference of *opinion* and *belief* in the first or second sentence.

Some think that the license as to opinion and the necessity of unity of faith that you preached, looks very much like the essentials and non-essentials of the sects, which you reprobated.

You denounced all human creeds, &c. but seemed to approbate the human written creed of the new church. Their covenant (or whatever it may be called) published with the memorial, looks to many as much like a creed as that of any other church; for after rejecting all creeds, &c. &c. &c. as terms of communion, &c. they go on to give their creed terms of fellowship, communion, &c. &c. And a query arises, is this not a *newer* creed than that of the Regulars?

You say in the last Harbinger that the creed, weak as it is, has worked mightily, for it has already divided the church in Connellsville. But the memorial says nothing about the creed and only speaks of a difference on two points—viz. the weekly breaking of bread and plurality of elders; and their other paper says they were suspended from the church simply for *acting* contrary to the will of the church, expressed in their vote on the memorial; and the creed says nothing for or against the weekly communion or a plurality of elders. How is this to be reconciled with your declaration that the creed of the New Association has divided the church?

There are many other things said, but I will not weary your patience farther, hoping that you will in your next Harbinger make the foregoing straight and plain, so as to be understood by common capacities, which I opine you ought to do to satisfy many beside

AN INQUIRER.

Response.

My dear Sir,

THAT you are candid in the questions you have propounded, I am almost persuaded; that you were once almost in the spirit of reformation, I have good reason to think; and if I had your promise that you would courageously come out from among them who substitute their creed or abstract notions for the plain and positive commandments of that Jesus whom you have confessed, and whose approbation you say you appreciate more than the universe besides; I would be at all reasonable pains to remove every difficulty out of your way. As charity hopes all things, I will, so far as my opportunity now admits, briefly attend to the matters propounded, and then leave you to act out in full the character of an honest inquirer.

Difficulty 1*st.* How shall we determine what is matter of faith, and what matter of opinion?

Solution.—Matters of faith are the facts testified in the Scriptures. God's promises, as well as his threatenings, are all facts. It is a fact that he has promised, that he has threatened, that he has uttered such things. Things done are facts. Things spoken are amongst things done. It is a fact that God created Adam—that he spoke to Adam—that he pronounced blessings upon the obedient, and curses on the disobedient, &c. The whole testimony of God is a record of sayings and doings. It contains precepts, ordinances, promises, threatenings, &c. All these are objects of faith—the promises are objects of hope—the threatenings objects of fear as well as of faith. Laws require obedience, but they are first received by faith—promises call for hope, but they are received by faith—Jesus calls for love to himself, but he is an object of faith, &c. &c. I am doubtless understood.

Opinions are strictly, in my use of the word, and in that of Walker and other lexicographers, "persuasions of the mind, *without proof*," abstract views—notions. Opinion differs from both faith and knowledge. I *know* that the sun gives light, that birds sing, that a rose yields an agreeable odor, that sugar is sweet, and that marble is

solid, &c. I *believe* that God sent Moses, that Pharaoh reigned over Egypt in the time of Joseph, that Washington was a patriot, that Joshua was the saviour of Israel, and that Jesus is the Messiah, &c. I *opine* that you are an honest man, that the electric fluid is the vital principle of animated nature, differently combined; that the world will exist only seven thousand years from its creation to its final dissolution.

Testimony is essential to faith; evidence of sense to knowledge, in its strict and philosophic import; and speculation, inference, or conjecture, to opinion. The ideas acquired by faith are, I own, in a subordinate sense, called knowledge; because of the certainty which the mind feels in good testimony. By *faith* I *understand* or *know* that the worlds were framed by the word of God. It is only by faith that I understand or feel assured that the universe was *created by the word of God.* Thomas is said to have believed when he saw; but this imports not that faith comes by sight, but that he believed the testimony of those who saw the risen Jesus when he saw the print in his hands and feet. All exceptions and objections to this definition of faith, knowledge, and opinion, are easily disposed of; for in propriety of language and of mental philosophy, faith comes by hearing testimony—knowledge, by the exercise of our minds and senses upon the objects presented to our senses—and opinions, by our reasonings on all subjects where both testimony and experience are wanting.

To apply this to religion:—We have faith in God's testimony; knowledge when we understand and experience the truth revealed—and opinions upon all subjects of which we have neither testimony nor experience. A *believes* that all christians are the elect of God, and is of *opinion* that men are elected unconditionally before they believe, and that there are elect sinners as well as elect saints. C believes that God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, &c. but is of opinion that it was the world of the elect. D believes that all who enter the kingdom of heaven and truly enjoy the blessings of the kingdom of Jesus in this present life, are born of the Spirit; and is of opinion that this is "by the direct and positive influence of the Spirit," operating abstractly upon the heart. E believes that every believer in Christ ought to be baptized; and is of opinion that infants without faith may be baptized. F believes that all who were baptized into Christ by the Apostles, put on Christ, were baptized into his death, and buried with him in baptism; but is of opinion that sprinkling water upon the face is a burial with Christ, although the subject of it believes as much in Mahomet as in Christ, &c. &c.

Suffice it to say, that men may form some opinion upon every thing that is matter of record; but the things recorded are the only legitimate objects of faith; and all persuasions or notions, without proof, are but opinions concerning these things.

2*d.* "The oneness mentioned in John xvii. seems to allude to more than faith—that they may be one as we are one."

There is unity of design, of operation and co-operation, as well as unity of faith. When there is union of faith, love, design, and operation, then is the union perfect.

3*d*. "The memorial presented to the church calls the same thing difference of *opinion* and *belief* in the first or second sentence."

Grammarians do not always speak according to their own rules. Some men *modestly* call their belief *opinions:* but this is no proof that *belief* and *opinion* are one and the same thing.

4*th*. "Is not the licence as to opinions, and the necessity of unity of faith, like the essentials and non-essentials of the sects?"

Things that are analogous are not the same. But these are unlike; for the essentials and non-essentials of the sects are about the things that God has positively commanded. He has positively commanded those who believe to be immersed; yet some say that it is not essential whether men are immersed or sprinkled; or, to use their own words, "whether they are baptized in any way." Men cannot be of one opinion, but they may be of one faith. There is, says Paul, "one faith"—one christian faith: but, says the same Apostle, "one man thinks" this, and "another thinks" that about certain things: hence there are many opinions. We have no control over men's opinions more than over their color or stature; but should they impose their opinions on others, or seek to make a party to them, then they become schismatics or factionists, and are to be dealt with as such. In all other cases the law is, "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind."

5*th*. "Do you not approve the written human creed of the new church—their covenant published with the memorial?"

I can see no written *human* creed or covenant in the narrative attached to said memorial. I see a declaration against all such documents, but no recognition of a substitute for them, but the living word of God. There is not a single human dogma or opinion proposed as a bond of union. Faith in Jesus as the Messiah, and obedience to him as God's Son—our Teacher, Priest, and King—I hope you do not call a human opinion, or a human creed! I trust you do not confound the requisition of good works and a godly behaviour in those who confess Jesus to be the Messiah, a human requisition, or a human creed! Men may make queries about every thing. But what sober-minded honest man can think that a person's declaring his faith in the testimony of God, and his confidence in Jesus Christ, and his avowal to walk in love with all who in word and deed acknowledge the Lord, as tantamount to subscribing any thing now in existence called a creed! any abstract of doctrine and opinion found in christendom?

6*th*. "Do you not ascribe to the creed adopted by the New Association an effect which it did not produce—viz. the exclusion of the church in Connellsville?"

I think not. Before that creed was adopted, while the Scriptures were acknowledged as the only creed, that congregation was one and undivided. What, let me ask, caused the new converts by Mr. Allen and his associates to eject the old disciples? Was it immorality? No allegation of the sort. Was it impiety? No such insinuation. Was it denying the Lord, or any institution of the Lord's? No one imagines it. Was it for making a faction to an opinion of their own? No one

alleged it. What, then? Because they wished to keep the commandments of Jesus Christ, and those who were in favor of the creed of eleven articles wished them to keep only such commandments, or as often as they and their confederates in favor of the creed had decreed expedient. The creed and discipline did not specify that the disciples ought to meet for breaking the loaf on the Lord's day, but only by the moon; and therefore those who walked by the last Will and Testament of Jesus Christ could not be permitted to continue in the church. They could not serve two masters—Christ and the Creed. They preferred the former, and the latter disowned them. If the creed said nothing against a plurality of elders and weekly communion, it said nothing for them. And that is just the difference in this case between the New Testament and the Creed. The New Testament says nothing against these things, it is true; but it says something *for* them.

EDITOR.

Reformation---No. 2.

WE are called Reformers. Reformers of what? Of religion? Religion cannot be reformed. It, like its author, is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. Reformers of what? Of creeds? It is easy to reform a creed. But of reformed creeds we have already a full library. The only creed which needs no reformation is the Bible. Therefore, we are not reformers of a creed. The Bible is our creed. Let Romanists and Presbyterians reform their own creeds; and then let their posterity reform them again in every generation. Our creed needs no reformation. Reformers of what, then, are we? Of our neighbors? Our neighbors must reform themselves. Reformation is a personal thing. I could as rationally eat, drink, and sleep for my neighbor, as reform for him. He must reform for himself, or perish from the way.

Why, then, are we called Reformers? We pretend not to reform our creed nor our neighbors; and what have we to do with Catholics or Protestants, except to show that they are something more or something less that Christians! Reformation is a good thing; but it is a personal concern, an individual's enterprize, to make himself more intelligent, pure, holy, and happy. Reform we thus? Then, indeed, we are reformers. In this sense, and in this sense only, can we be praised, admired, imitated.

In how many points, then, have we reformed? In knowledge? Of what? Of all the corruptions in doctrine and practice in christendom! But does this make the head or the heart better! Then may he enjoy good health and long life who has acquired the knowledge of human diseases. I do not say that the knowledge of the errors of the head or of the hearts of men—mistakes and crimes—is of no value. But we say it is not saving knowledge.

But we have acquired great knowledge of the Scriptures! If you know these you are happy!!—nay, indeed! but "if you know these

things, happy are you *if you* DO *them*." Reformation is, then, the fruit of knowledge—of that repentance, that change of views which the apprehension of the gospel—of the word of life, effects.

Have we reformed, then, in practice? This is the question. Wherein have the *preachers* of reformation reformed? Do they labor more abundantly, more indefatigably than the preachers of what we call false gospels or human dogmas? I ask the question; but let the preachers answer it. The Methodist travels, labors night and day, publicly and privately, from house to house, for the good of men's souls and for 120 dollars a-year, if he have no wife!! How many of the reforming brethren—I mean our preaching brethren, excel them in disinterested labors for the salvation of the world! How many of them are this winter lying on their oars, or out of the Lord's vineyard, and in their workshops, school-rooms, or on their farms!

"But the brethren," say they, "love to have it so. They will not encourage us to go abroad. They will not contribute any thing for our families, and we must take care of our wives and children!" Good logic. Two wrongs will make one right! The brethren love their money, and the preachers love their wives and their children; and Satan, or the Mahometans, or the sects may have the world! Or God must send Moses, Elijah, or Paul, from Paradise, or Heaven, to make another pilgrimage on earth! But these are reforming preachers, and these are reformed disciples! Tell it not in Kirkland! publish it not in Rome! lest Peter's successor rejoice—lest the Mormonites triumph. But what can the preachers of the original gospel do! Shame the brethren by their disinterested labors of love, seek first the kingdom of God and the righteousness required by him, and then the brethren will be ashamed, and repent, and reform. They will see, and know, and feel, and say, that "these brethren love the Lord, his cause, and people, more than we. They resemble the first christians who took joyfully the spoiling of their goods, and through good report and bad report, through hunger, and cold, and nakedness, sought the conversion of the world—while we only pray for it." Shall we, then, let the Lord and these preachers have all the work, the sufferings, and the glory! Can we do nothing because we are rich, and because we cannot leave home—because we cannot travel and proclaim! How unfortunate we are! We can do nothing but pray for the conversion of sinners; and teach our children, by our good example, to mind their own business, and to be prudent, economical, and frugal, and let these preachers have the eternal honor of turning many to righteousness! Alas for us! In the great harvest home we shall have no fruit. We shall have nothing to reap, to gather, or to bind. Not a sheaf to carry into the garner. We had no seed time; we, therefore, have no harvest! O that I had been a preacher, that I had possessed the gifts of knowledge and of utterance; for none can be honored as good and faithful servants of the Lord, but these preachers! On earth we only had the privilege of making corn, and wheat, and pork, and butter, and cheese, and the felicity of eating them. But now we are out of funds and out of credit; we have not a single deposite in the

Bank of Heaven; and all the Banks on earth are bankrupt! We had but one talent, and that was the talent of taking care of ourselves. But these preachers, these envied preachers, had five talents, and they gained five. They had a good deposite in the skies. Now they are rich and we are poor! Is this true? Has the Lord said to A, B, and C, in his word, or by his providence, 'Go, anounce the good news, convert the world, and you shall have treasure in heaven;' and to D, E, and F, 'Stay at home; take care of yourselves: let the preachers do all—labor, preach, and pray. Let them ride or walk, fast and pray; let their wives and children suffer in the flesh; but take care of your own; I will reward you on earth, and them in heaven!'

Wherein, then, do the brethren who preach only by their works, excel? In how many points have they reformed? They are honest, industrious, and frugal. Their word or promise is as good as a sealed bond. They are hospitable and kind. They teach their children to know the Lord, and they are full of good works. So far, so good. But is this true of all? Of the majority? Then how comes it to pass that they suffer any one in their communion to violate his word, to break his contract, to neglect to provide for his family? Why do they endure those who are lazy bodies, covenant breakers, and those who bring not up their children in the knowledge and discipline of the Lord?

In morals, how exemplary? In christian, character how amiable? In piety, how genuine? In zeal, how ardent and intelligent? These are questions which our enemies will propound. Brethren, how shall we individually and collectively answer them?

I have known the good cause to languish in one neighborhood by the behaviour of two or three *Reformers*, as they were called. One of them had been somewhat enthusiastic, once thought he had a call to preach; he travelled much, denied himself, rather sacrificed his own interests, was liberal to his fellow-laborers; but he became a reformer—saw that he had no special voice or call from heaven to preach. He stayed at home, minded his farm, became less liberal than before, withdrew all his subscriptions to every thing he had patronized under the idea of promoting the cause of the gospel, became less hospitable and less frequent in his attendance at church. A clergyman in the neighborhood, who had unsuccessfully assailed "the reformation" while the theory was preached, finding his labors were not successful on that ground, seized the occasion which J—— C—— gave him, and pointed to this gentleman as a practical Reformer; instanced in him all that I have specified; and holding him up as a living model of the reformation for which we labored and toiled, turned away the people's ears from the cause, and saved his congregation from reformation!

Now, brethren, ought we thus to betray the Lord into the hands of men? Forbid it, Heaven! Better to have one convert to God—one practical reformer, than a thousand such! No wonder that Paul wept when he saw *many* walk as enemies of the *cross* of Christ—whose *god* was in their barn, cellar, and corn-crib—who deified their appetites, "gloried in their shame, and minded earthly things."

In some states north of Bethany several Baptist and other preachers have reformed, and with them several of their former congregations. Are they now proclaiming the word of the Lord, and the brethren holding up their hands? What are they doing? They alone can answer this question. I am misinformed if our opponents are not rejoicing at this moment, that many "reforming preachers" are constrained to stay at home and follow the plough, the shuttle, or the plane! Paul, however, was a tent-maker! Yes, and he followed it in Corinth too! But it was before he had founded a church in that place! I would labor all night rather than ask a heathen or an infidel to assist me in preaching Christ! What! shall I send my Lord a-begging to Satan! And if his friends will turn him out of doors and deny him lodging, the Lord have mercy upon them!

Brethren, let every man bring the question home to himself—Wherein have I reformed? What lack I yet? We can flatter no man in the kingdom of Christ more than those out of it. Let us practise what we profess, and what we preach. God being my helper, I would lash the faults of a brother reformer as I would the faults of any other man making any profession of honor or honesty. Read again Paul's Epistles, and see whether he spared the Christians more than the Jews or Gentiles! The Lord help us to follow his example, as he followed Christ! and may the Lord bless all the *holy brethren!*

EDITOR.

Irresponsible Preachers.

THE restoration of the original gospel and worship has not only to contend against the fierce assaults of its unmasked opposers, but against the treachery and delinquency of some of its professed friends and advocates. I do not say that any thing new or strange has happened to it in being thus betrayed into the hands of its enemies: for since the days of Judas, who sold his Master for 15 dollars, till now, there have not been wanting those who assumed the garb of christianity for the sake of making provision for the lusts of the flesh.

Men without the fear of God and love for the Saviour, have been found in the camp of Israel, not only wearing the armorial of the faith, but professedly fighting the battles of the Lord. It does not follow that the arrows of truth, though depatched from their bow, will not reach, nor pierce the hearts of the King's enemies. Judas, for all that appears to the contrary, when sent by the Messiah to anounce the approaching reign, was just as successful in proclaiming the word as any of the Twelve. We sometimes mistake when we appeal to what is called the usefulness of men, or their success in preaching the word, as evidence that the Lord is with them. Neither the word of God nor the ordinances of the gospel derive their virtue or influence from him that administers them. Balaam the son of Bosor, said many excellent things by the Spirit of God: so did Saul the son of Kish; yet the former loved the wages of unrighteousness, and the latter was

a rebel against the God of his father. Neither talent, nor usefulness, nor great success are to be plead in the absence of justice, humanity, purity, and the love of God. An immoral person is not to be trusted, countenanced, or sustained as a preacher of righteousness, if he had the zeal of Paul and the eloquence of Apollos.

It was not without good reason, and a perfect knowledge of human nature, that the Holy Spirit in Paul testified against the elevation of men to office, among the citizens of heaven, destitute of well-earned reputation. I do not merely allude to the inhibition of all novices from public stations, nor to his injunction that the servants of the congregation should be first well proved and found to be faithful men; but to his orders that a bishop must be *blameless*, and of high standing as to moral worth, deserving a good character even of the aliens themselves.

Now the question is, Are the brethren of the Restoration attentive to the apostolic injunctions and to the dictates of good reason in making their selections, and in sustaining only those of good fame? While we are happy to discover a growing and increasing attention to this all-important matter, we are not without evidence that in several places there is a very great remissness on the subject.

I know of one proclaimer now sustained by some brethren in the counties of Stark, Holmes, and Wayne, Ohio, and probably in other regions, who declares himself *irresponsible* to man. God made him a minister, and none but God can depose him. And yet his character is not so godlike as to remove all suspicions on the subject of his divine mission. He has been accused of a high offence against the laws of the state of Ohio, as well as of great inattention to the 18th verse of the 7th chapter of Paul's 1st Epistle to the Corinthians. But the brethren say he has confessed his fault and asked forgiveness from God, and God has forgiven him, and they ought to forgive him. Others say he has at one time confessed, and at another so extenuated and neutralized his confessions as to make it *a very little sin*. But the brethren say God has forgiven him, and they ought! How do they know God has forgiven him for the injury that he has done to the name and honor of his Son—for representing Christ as the minister of sin, and the patron of lasciviousness? Has he evinced contrition, shame, and unfeigned penitence? Has he humbled himself before God and the people by taking the back seat? or has he professed to be above law, above all responsibility to his brethren? and does he force himself upon the brethren—divide churches on the very ground that they are unwilling to fellowship one who has brought disgrace upon their own confession of the faith? I ask, Are these the evidences of his repentance, and that God has forgiven him!—? Then I must read the Old Testament and the New over again; moreover, I must unlearn all that I have learned of human nature.

To see a professed preacher of truth and purity outbraving all discipline, defying the authority of the congregation, incensed at those who will not countenance him in his course, and denouncing brethren because they are conscientious in obeying the precept found 1st

Cor. v. 11. is, to me, a new sort of evidence that God has forgiven him!

But if God had forgiven him, and the brethren too, does it follow that he must be elevated to the place from which he fell? Does he ask this as proof that they have forgiven him? If he do, he is greatly at fault indeed! The Lord forgave Moses for a hasty word and action, but he would not suffer him to lead Israel into Canaan. Let the brethren forgive upon good evidence of contrition and reformation; but they cannot restore the forgiven to any conspicuity in the congregation, if they have respect either to precept or example: for he that occupies a high station in the church must be *blameless* and free from *bad fame* as respects the common sense and common law of civilized society; moreover, he must "have a good report of those that are without."

But what have the brethren to do to sustain a person who boasts that he will not be responsible to them. This I heard the gentleman in question say, and numbers have said that he thus expressed himself to them. The greatest despot in East or West can say no more. Neither King, Pope, nor Priest can assume more. And if for no other fault nor arrogancy than this, such a one is not to be countenanced by any man who believes that all officers are servants of the people and responsible to them.

I would not have noticed, at this time, this unhappy case, had it not been that I am just returned from a visit to the theatre of these lawless assumptions, and that to abstract the attention of the brethren from the question of righteousness and purity, other questions have been got up by this gentleman—such as "the ordinance of washing the saints' feet," and "the right of females to preach"—greatly to the disturbance of the churches, and injury of the cause.

I have not as yet *named* this gentleman, affording him space for reformation; and if it had not been that I fear God more than man, I should not have hazarded what I have done: for unless he, indeed, repent of his follies and transgressions of the laws of Christ, I have reason to fear that I shall not fare well in the tender mercies of his tongue. But I dare no longer be silent in such a case.

Unless the brethren are more circumspect in those they elevate to honor in the church, and in receiving and sustaining only such persons as are well recommended to them by persons of credit, the cause will continue to suffer by the incursions of wolves in sheep's clothing. We have much to say on this subject, but must defer it to a more convenient season. EDITOR.

Converted Jews.

OUR faith is weak in all the reports of converted Jews, which have fallen under our eye for many years. Neither is it very strong in the reports we read of converted Pagans. Converted they may be from the profession of Idolatry and Judaism; but whether converted

indeed and in truth to Jesus Christ, demands from us a doubt. Our views of the present schismatic and antichristian state of christendom render such reports of difficult belief. We think that neither Jews nor Gentiles can be converted in despite of the prayer of the Messiah, (John xvii.) If he made the union of the disciples in faith, love, design, and operation, essential to the conviction and conversion of the world, I am so constituted as to believe that it will be found so in experience.

The following report was to me incredible, before I heard of the imposition practised by the convert. The reason was that I could not think that any Jew could sincerely and honestly submit to the whole ceremonial of antitrinitarian or trinitarian affusion, preceded by such a parade of magnificent formality. His prayer before sprinkling for the Pastor of the church, and all the incidents of the scene, as reported, are wholly unworthy of an intelligent Jew, and especially of such a one as had examined the New Testament with that attention and candor necessary to a full conviction that Jesus of Nazareth is the true Messiah. I will not say that in the present state of christendom the conversion of one Jew to Jesus Christ is absolutely impossible; but to me, at least, it is highly improbable. But we shall lay this curious affair before our readers without farther comment.

ED. M. H.

From the Christian Register, of November 15.

BAPTISM OF A JEWISH CONVERT TO CHRISTIANITY.

The following account of the sacred administration of baptism is taken from the "Christian Reformer."

On Sunday, 27th of April, a novel and most interesting event took place in Strand Street Meeting-House, Dublin—the baptism of Joel Nathan Levi, a Jew, of the tribe of Judah, a native of Plutzk, on the Vistula, in Poland. The Rev. J. Armstrong delivered a discourse on the rite of baptism, taking for his text Matt. xxviii. 18—20. The sermon being concluded, the preacher proceeded to give a memoir of the convert; stated the reasons why he and his colleague had so long delayed to admit him to baptism—namely, that they thought it due not only to themselves, but also to Mr. Nathan, to make a strict investigation of his moral character; which having been done, and every satisfaction obtained on the subject, no farther obstacle remained to his admission into the church of Christ. He gave us a little sketch of his (Mr. Nathan's) mind, in its progress from Judaism to Christianity; or, as we take leave to express it, in its journey from Mount Sinai to the Mount of Olives. Disapproving entirely of the Trinitarian views, and finding by the study of the Scriptures, that Christianity itself is not accountable for such doctrines, he embraced it in its purity, being ignorant at that time of the existence of any sect professing Unitarian Christianity. Of this important circumstance he was informed in Prussia by Friedlander, who told him such were to be found in England; and this induced him, like Nathaniel, to come and see He also supplied him with the writings of Moses Mendelsohn, who treats of this faith, and had a controversy on the subject with the celebrated Lavater. Mr. Armstrong having concluded his statement, proceeded to put some questions to Mr. Levi, bearing on the leading truths of Christianity, all of which he having answered in the affirmative, was called on to speak for himself, and much interested the audience by his solemn and feeling manner. He spoke forcibly against Trinitarianism, assuring us that his brethren could never be made to believe in a Triune God.

"What!" said he, "if Trinitarianism be true, why did Christ, when he prayed in his agony, say, Not *my* will, but *thine* be done? Why not say, Not *mine*, but *ours* be done?" He assured us he could show many letters from Trinitarian Christians, earnestly inviting him into their church, and offering him many advantages; which invitations he had rejected, from the conviction that *Unitarian Christianity alone* is the truth of Scripture; and protested that he had no sinister or mercenary motives in what he was about to do. He then called on all present to join with him in prayer, which he delivered with equal propriety and fervor, imploring the grace of God for his brethren, and praying that the afflicted might be comforted by the contemplation of the sufferings and patience of our divine Master; thus affectionately alluding to the recent trial of one of our much respected Pastors. The prayer being ended, the Rev. Dr. Drummond performed the ceremony of baptism. Immediately on its conclusion, that beautiful anthem was struck up—

"Glory, honor, praise, and power,
Be unto the Lamb forever:
Jesus Christ is our Redeemer,
Hallelujah! Hallelujah!"

This had a touching and powerful effect. We know not how others felt; but to us it seemed as the hymning of angels: Dr. Drummond then proceeded to address the new disciple, which he did with even more than his usual eloquence and strength, taking occasion to reprobate in forcible terms that persecuting spirit which the Christians through so many ages had manifested, and still continue to manifest, towards the Jews; which spirit, united with the corruptions heaped upon Christianity, has rendered that odious in their eyes, which, had it been permitted to wear its own lovely garb, would, long ere this, have incited the sons of Israel to take down their harps from the willows, and tune them to the high praises of the Redeemer.

The whole service lasted about three hours. The house was well filled; there were present a great number of Christians of various denominations, and, we are informed several Jewish families.

Conversions from Judaism to Christianity are among rare things. What may be the final influence upon the Jews of the great change which has taken place in European countries, in the conduct of Christians towards them, it is impossible to predict. The subsiding of that deadly hostility which formerly existed against them, on the part of Christians, and the indications of a spirit more conformable to that of the true Messiah, may do something towards allaying Jewish prejudices. But still we cannot blame our brethren in the faith, for being slow to credit conversions, and to require, as in the instance we have presented, all the evidence which the nature of the case admits, before receiving them into the visible church of Christ.

From the Christian Register, of November 16.

BAPTISM OF A JEWISH CONVERT.

We published last week an account of the baptism of Joel Nathan Levi, a Polish Jew, professing to be converted to Christianity. We have always been slow to believe the sincerity of such conversions; but in the account (which we took from a foreign journal) there was said to have been much caution and delay before the ordinance was administered. Upon this we remarked that "we cannot blame our brethren in the faith for being slow to credit conversions [of Jews] and to require, as in the instance presented, all the evidence which

the nature of the case admits, before receiving them into the church of Christ." The following letter, addressed to us, shows that we might have expressed our incredulity much more strongly:—

HINGHAM, November 17, 1834.

DEAR SIR—*I am to blame for not apprising you that Mr. Levi, the Jew, whose conversion and baptism are noticed in your last Register, is a* counterfeit. *He was guilty of lying, cheating, theft, &c. after his baptism, and before, as it has since been found. I have the facts if it be necessary to publish them—but think it is not—yet, from me you may say, (as from some one it should be said,) that he is a deceiver.*

Yours truly, C. BROOKS.

Notices of the War and the Campaign of 1834.

THERE are no winter quarters in the good fight of faith, neither is there a truce nor an armistice in the war between truth and error. Six thousand years are now nearly completed since the first lie was told on earth, and from that day till now the contest has continued. —In our part of the camp, and along the lines of the antagonist armies, in our continent, the belligerents are still active. As respects the faith formerly delivered to the saints, the allied sects, like the ancient Philistines, are still sounding new defiances against the armies of the God of Israel. Many of our friends have mistaken the lines of battle because of the smoke, and, without knowing it, are either forging shot for their enemies' batteries, or applying the match to their cannon. Great, indeed, is the confusion; and the policy of the allied Captains seems to be to increase rather than diminish it.

In North Carolina the *Baptist Interpreter* has been interpreting, without license for both armies. In Philadelphia the *Christian Gazette* has picked up the shot of the late Mr. Jennings, and finds that they exactly suit the calibre of his little guns; and with these he is doing great execution on the Baptist redoubts. Mr. Smith, of the *Recorder*, has imported Queen Ann's Pocket-Piece and the blunderbuss of King Harry VIII. and valiantly defends the faith of the Archbishops. The *Baptist Register*, of New York, has more powder than lead, and compensates the want of metal by its superlative noise. Towards the centre of the lines pamphleteers, little poets, and musicians sing and play the war songs of 1642 and 1535—and so it goes.

Many recruits have been enlisted on the side of the Apostles during the last year; but they are very imperfectly disciplined, and know not the tactics of the Army of the Faith. The Sword of the Spirit is their only offensive weapon, and they use it awkwardly, but are daily improving themselves; and, upon the whole, the citizen soldiers of the Prince of Peace are in good spirits, still adding courage to their faith, and knowledge to their courage.

To come to the literal: Much has been done—much is doing—but more is yet to be done before the victory is won. But our motto is,

"*Glory to the victor, and victory to the brave!*" We will still wear the armor of light, and continue to wrestle against the rulers of the darkness of this age, and spiritual wickedness in high places.

The new champions of the popular schemes will deserve a notice in the next volume, especially our friend of the *Interpreter*, who seems to have become more confident than any of his fellows, and has tendered us page for page even in his own territory. There is something more manly, and certainly something much more gentlemanly in Mr. Meredith, than is to be met with amongst his confederates; for all of which we will remember him in the coming year. We cannot reply to a score at once—only so far as in replying to one, we may reply to all. But, the Lord willing, we intend to place the controversy in a new attitude before the public in the next year. We will show the whole ground of debate in one full moon, at its zenith. It has been viewed too much in the crepusculous light of evening, in the gibbous and crescent forms. We must place its full face in a cloudless sky before the eyes of those who wish to measure its mountains and vallies by the telescope of Peter the Prince of the Apostles.

EDITOR.

☞AFTER the January number, we have made arrangements to mail the Harbinger on the first mail day of every month for the ensuing year.

☞WE expect and hope to travel more than usual during the ensuing year, the Lord willing. On deciding the rival claims of numerous sections, we incline not to be arbitrary, and have nearly adopted this resolution—to be governed by the number of readers we have in various places; our experience hitherto proving that we can be most useful in those regions, because there is something to work upon in the minds of such communities. For at least seven years we have longed to visit the Western part of New York and the New England states; but have hitherto been prevented. We have not yet despaired.

EDITOR.

From Moore's St. Chrysostom.

WHY come ye to the house of prayer
With jewels in your braided hair?
And wherefore is the house of God
By glittering feet profanely trod;
As if, vain things, ye come to keep
Some festival, and not to weep?
Oh! prostrate weep before the Lord
  Of earth and heaven, of life and death—
Who blights the fairest with a word,
  And blasts the mightiest with a breath!
Go! 'tis not thus, in bright array,
Such sinful souls would dare to pray.
Vainly to anger'd Heaven ye raise
Luxurious hands where diamonds blaze;
And she who comes in broidered veil,
To weep her frailty, *still* is frail.

"The Christian Baptist."

PROPOSALS,

By D. S. BURNET, of Cincinnati, for re-publishing by subscription, *THE CHRISTIAN BAPTIST*, revised by Mr. *A. Campbell*, the Editor—in one large royal octavo volume.

The "Christian Baptist" was the first publication in the current reformation, and the model of all the others. Concerning the history and developments of the first seven years, its place can be supplied by no other work; and it will always continue to be the most important book of reference for that period of our religious history. Moreover, it has the advantage of all the subsequent periodicals, in the number and variety of its well written and elaborate essays. Of these there are about one hundred from the pen of Mr. Campbell, embracing several series on the most important subjects ever discussed. Many thousands of persons have been converted to God by the gospel contended for in the Christian Baptist, since it ceased being published, who are not furnished with the work. To these the essays on the Restoration of the Ancient Order of Things will be worth the price of the whole book; and it may be added, all who wish to possess themselves of the most valuable documents in the Reformation, will do well to secure a copy of this cheap and valuable edition. It will require a very large edition to pay expences.

The re-publication will comprise all of the first edition, excepting such notices of persons and events as are uninteresting and unnecessary in a permanent and standard work. Mr. Campbell having promised it a thorough revision, it is intended to render the volume as perfect as possible.

TERMS:

1. The work will comprise about 1800 pages of the seven volumes of the "Christian Baptist," in *one* large and handsome royal octavo volume—two columns on a page. The paper will be fair and the type will be distinct, and of good size.

2. The binding will compare with the value of the work.

3. For this work, which originally cost subscribers Ten Dollars, (including postage and binding,) will be asked *Four Dollars*.

4. To those who subscribe for ten copies, one will be allowed; three for twenty; eight for fifty; and eighteen for one hundred. These deductions will only be made to those who pay the money upon delivery of the books. In all other cases ten per cent. will be allowed for sales and collections.

5. All the agents for the Millennial Harbinger, Evangelist, Messenger, Christian Advocate, Apostolic Advocate, and Christian Casket, are requested to act as agents for this work. In getting subscribers to a work involving so great expense, care should be taken to get none but such as will pay. It is hoped that agents will certify the progress of their subscriptions by February 1st, either to one of the general agents, or to the publisher.

General Agents.—Alexander Campbell, Bethany, Brooke county, Virginia; John T. Johnson, Georgetown, Scott county, Kentucky.

Cincinnati, November 10, 1834.

AS I am, in no pecuniary sense of the word, interested in the re-publication of the *Christian Baptist*; and as I am not the only writer which appears on the pages of that work, may I be permitted to say, that the re-publication of it has long appeared to myself and many others a *desideratum?* I rely not upon my own judgment only when I say, that it was the first and principal means of stirring up the community on the subject of primitive christianity, and of spreading abroad in society a leaven which has wrought mightily. What it has

already done is the best reason which can be urged for its republication. How few are they who have carefully read this work, that have not been converted to the ancient religion! The many importunities which I have received from all parts of the union for its re-appearance in a more finished form, have generally made this a plea—that it was suited to the times—to the people—that what it had achieved was the best demonstration of its utility.

It has been suggested that if we were to learn a lesson from the sects around us, we would keep this work circulating as far and as fast as possible. Whatever works of theirs prove themselves to be useful to their cause, these they circulate with the greatest liberality. It is not works of taste and of fine composition that exert the greatest influence in the world; nor is it the works which appear to their authors most likely to be useful, that are always so. "Time and chance happen to all." Neither Bacon, Locke, nor Newton, was distinguished for rhetoric or fine taste; but for good sense and good logic. Their writings have done more for the world than all the rhetoricians of two thousand years.

It is the *argument* that is found in this work, which has pioneered the way for the conversion of society to a better order of things. And as not *authorship*, but *argument* has commended it, I can, with the greater propriety, express my desire that our laborious, zealous, and self denied brother *Burnet*, who has sacrificed so much in the good cause, may be liberally patronized in this undertaking, and that he may lose nothing through his enterprizing efforts to sustain and carry forward the begun Reformation.

Though wearied and exhausted in the laborious attentions to a Printing Office, and all its multitudinous cares and concerns, such have been my convictions that this work ought to be reprinted, that, if some enterprizing spirit had not of himself come forward, I should have been compelled to have undertaken it. I will cheerfully revise the whole work, and exclude from it such mere local and ephemeral matters and things, as, however necessary they might have been, are now no longer necessary in a work which is both sentimental, argumentative, and historical, and intended to be by the republisher a book of reference for this generation and the next.

☞Subscriptions will be received at this Office. Orders sent on from any of our Agents will be punctually attended to. Agents desirous of obtaining subscribers, will please copy off the proposals of brother Burnet. A written copy will answer every purpose.

Ed. Mill. Harb.

ERRATA.

During our absence, while the two first forms of this number were in press, two misprints occurred of some magnitude:—"No. XI." for *No. XII.*; and page 378, 15th line from top, "Nahum prophesied before Christ, year 713," instead of 113.

INDEX TO VOL. V.

A

ABSTRACT Spirit, 600
Acceptable Worship, not Will-Worship, 463
Address of Churches in Illinois, 599
Angels of the Seven Asiatic Congregations, 292
Apostolic Advocate, 188
Apostles, turning out, 17

B

Baltimore, Church in, 383
Bacon, Sir Francis, on Atheism, 338
——————— on Superstition, 340
Baptism for Remission, 259
Big Meetings, 400
Brantly, Mr. a Religious rather than a True Narrator, 92
Brantly & Ballantine, Messrs. 133

C

Catholic Controversy, No. 2, 9.—No. 3, 67 No. 4, 177; No. 5, 266; No. 6, 321; No. 7, 346
Catholic Confession of Faith, 236
Campbellism Unmasked, 375
Caution, 384
Chaplain to Congress, 26
——— to the Roman Senate, 27
Christian Scheme of Education, 343
Christendom in its Dotage, 371
Chambers, Uriel B., Letter from, 477
Editor's remarks on, *ibid.*
Church Record, 503
——— Form of, 506
Christian Theology in the East, 511
Church Union, a New Plan of, 590
Church at Connellsville, 607
Circular of the Black River Association, 503
Cleland, Dr. Thomas, 164
———, Thomas, D. D. 370
Coffee-House at Surat, 28
Copy-Right for the People, 54
Conscience, 73, 241, 498
Conversations in Father Goodal's Family Circle, 221, 318, 356, 556, 594
Co-operation. Contribution for the Gospel, 313
Converted Infidel, 354
Converted Jews? 616
Creeds *vs.* the Bible. A New Case, 525
Creed's, the Old, better than the New, 537

D

Deluge, Proofs of 33
Decree of Pope Lucius III. against Heretics, 257
Disciples, a Hint to, 34, 287
Divorces, 70
Disorganizers and Demoralizers, 9
Difficulty, worthy of solution, 309
Dirge, 336
Duty of laboring assiduously and praying unceasingly for the abolition of War, 306

E

Episcopal Recorder *vs.* New Version, 560
Essay on the Style of the Living Oracles, 198
" " " " " " " 270

F

Faith and Immersion, both exploded by the Six Presumptions, 176
Faith, definition of, 344
Fasting, 106, 108
Fowler's, Mr. Conversations at, 60, 160
Fragments—from Philologus, 467

G

Gift of the Holy Spirit, 166, 217, 277, 299, 365 508, 568
Godliness, form and power of, 570
Grew, Henry, to A. Campbell, 117
Grew, Henry, Reply to, 119
——— ——— Letter from, 466
Green and Howard, Elders, 144

H

Hearing by the soul and hearing by the ear, 137
Henley, Elder T. M. Letter from, 517
Health of Children—Early Rising, 574
Hints on Mr. Hinton's Association Sermon, 82
Hinton, J. T. 231
How Indians read the Bible, 40
Howell, R. B. C. a presumptuous Plagiarist, 238
Horrors of Heathenism, 530
——————— Remarks on, 535
Hygeian System, 89
Hydrophobia, cure for, 192

I

Immersion, six Methodistic presumptions against, 174
Irresponsible Preachers, 614

J

Jerusalem, Fall of, 88
Jones, William, Letter to, 584
John's Baptism, an immersion for the remission of sins, 267

INDEX.

K

KINGDOM OF HEAVEN—(EXTRA.)

Preface, 386
Kingdom of Heaven, elements of 403
" " subjects of, 408
" " laws of, 410
" " territory of, 411
" " induction into, 412
" " coming of, 414
" " present administration of, 421
" " address to the citizens of, 427
Abraham, 391
Ascension of the Messiah, 419
A Word to Friendly Aliens, 433
Address to the Belligerent Aliens, 436
Covenant of Circumcision, 392
Coronation of the Messiah, 420
Constitution, 406
King, 408
Manners and Customs, 412
Name, 404
Patriarchal Age of the World, 387
Sinaitic Covenant, 393
Two Promises, 392
Two Seeds, 394
The Blessing of Abraham, *ibid.*
The Jewish Institution, 395

L

Letters, &c. to A. Campbell, 56, 109, 208, 248
Library, a good, 490

M

M'Call's, J. R. Vindication, 268
Meeting Houses, 7
Meredith, Mr. 382
Methodist Episcopacy, Narrative of, 450, 493
Millennium, 454, 481, 548, 577
Modern Gospel Dogmas, 183
Mother's Gift, 384
Modern Order of Things, 515
Mystic Preachers nullify the Oracles, 245
Mysteries of Orthodoxy, 365

N

Naturalization, 81
New Dictionary, 144
New Version Defended, 150, 204, 274, 296, 350
New Arrangements respecting our publications, 575
New Discovery, 602
Notes on a Tour to N. York, 13, 36, 75, 81, 122

O

Obituary, 336, 383, 603

P

Paul before Agrippa—a Poem, 240
Popular Sophism, 310
Praying in the Spirit, 289
Prayer, power of, 356
Preface, 3
Presbyterian Denomination, present state of, 360
Principles—not Men, 252
Professed Restorers of the Ancient Gospel, 92
Protracted meeting in Baltimore, 253
Psalms, Hymns, and Spiritual Songs, 239

Q

Queries, 96, 140, 382, 541

R

Religious Narrator, Letter to the Editor and Publishing Committee, 173
Reform, Progress of, 44, 95, 186, 232, 280, 329 177, 467, 518, 571, 604
Reformation, address to the brethren of, 86, 183
Religious Feelings and Impressions, 255
Repentance, a Definition of, 345
Remarks on General Meetings, 461
Religion—a Poem, 480
Reformation, 501, 611
Right of Opinion, 25
Reformed Clergyman, 454, 481, 548, 577

S

Sectarian Inconsistency Exposed, 513
Sermon on the Mode of Christian Immersion, by Alex. A. Campbell, of Tennessee, 564
She'll make a Manager, 516
Signs of the Times, by S. M'Corkle, 20, 49, 97 145, 193
Six Rules of Scripture Interpretation, 487
Solomon, a greater than, 335
Spirit of the Nations of Antiquity, 341
Superstitious Credulity, 43
Summary of News, 334

T

Table, exhibiting the important events in profane history during the life of Christ, 262
The Body of Christ, 5
The Old Man of the Church, 42
The First day of the Week is not the Seventh day, 465
Timothy, Reply to, 314
Truth, 208
Translations, 489

U

Union, Proposition for, 101
Union, Importance of, 102
Unconditional Pardon 376

W

Waterman, J. A., Reply to, 60, 113, 155, 213 250
Watts', Dr., Testimony, 359
Waterman, J. A. 337
——————as found in the Christian Advocate, 446
Waterman, J. A., Reply to, 448
Weekly Communion, 12
Wesley's Small Points, 303
Wesley, John, a Reformer, 601
Wherein do you excel? 47
War and Campaign of 1834, notices of, 619

COTNER COLLEGE

286.6
C15m
V

SL

COTNER COLLEGE